

Circuit Court for Howard County  
Case No.: C-13-CV-24-001055

UNREPORTED\*

IN THE APPELLATE COURT

OF MARYLAND

No. 845

September Term, 2025

---

IN THE MATTER OF  
MAY SHING

---

Graeff,  
Berger,  
Wright, Alexander, Jr.  
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

---

PER CURIAM

---

Filed: June 1, 2026

\*This is a per curiam opinion. Under Rule 1-104, the opinion is not precedent within the rule of stare decisis, nor may it be cited as persuasive authority.

Appellant May Shing petitioned the Circuit Court for Howard County for judicial review of a decision of the Maryland Insurance Administration affirming the dismissal of her complaint against appellee Liberty Mutual Insurance Company. On March 11, 2025, the circuit court scheduled a hearing for May 30. On May 13, Shing moved for a postponement. The next day, the court noted on the motion that, without a Motion to Shorten Time, it would not be ripe for ruling until after the scheduled hearing. Shing did not file any motion and failed to appear at the hearing. Liberty Mutual moved to dismiss in open court, and the court granted the motion. One week later, Shin moved for a new trial, claiming that she had been unable to attend the hearing because her car malfunctioned that morning. The court denied her motion, and this appeal followed.

Whether to grant a continuance “is in the sound discretion of the trial court.” *Serio v. Baystate Props., LLC*, 209 Md. App. 545, 554 (2013) (cleaned up). Similarly, we review the denial of a motion for new trial for an abuse of discretion. *Butkiewicz v. State*, 127 Md. App. 412, 421 (1999). We will reverse a court’s exercise of its discretion only if the court’s decision is “well removed from any center mark imagined by the reviewing court and beyond the fringe of what that court deems minimally acceptable.” *In re Andre J.*, 223 Md. App. 305, 323 (2015) (cleaned up).

We begin with the denial of Shing’s request for a continuance. The court here considered Shing’s request against the backdrop of the motion’s untimeliness.<sup>1</sup> It then weighed the documentation attached—all of which pertained to injuries that Shing’s adult

---

<sup>1</sup> Shing served her motion by mail, so it would not have been ripe for ruling until April 2, 2025. *See* Md. Rules 1-203(a), (c) & 2-311(b).

daughter sustained in an accident in January 2025 (two months before the court even scheduled the hearing)—before concluding that a continuance was not warranted given the ample time Shing had to request a timely postponement or to request a remote appearance. We cannot say that the court’s decision was so far “beyond the fringe” of what we would deem minimally acceptable as to be an abuse of discretion.

Moreover, and contrary to Shing’s argument, Maryland Rule 18-102.6 did not require the court to grant her a continuance. Although the Maryland Rules “do[] not preclude [] judge[s] from making reasonable accommodations to protect a self-represented litigant’s right to be heard,” they also do not require them to make any. Md. Rule 18-102.6 cmt. 2. *See also Tretick v. Layman*, 95 Md. App. 62, 86 (1993) (noting that, in Maryland, no different procedural, evidentiary, and appellate rules apply when parties appear *pro se*). Thus, the court was not required to grant Shing a continuance and did not abuse its discretion in denying one.

As for the denial of Shing’s motion for new trial, the record reflects that she attached to her motion documentation corroborating her claim that her car malfunctioned the morning of the hearing and was not drivable. That said, the documents show that Sing called AAA at 9:04 AM and that AAA finished examining her car no later than 10:48 AM. Yet the hearing here was scheduled for 1:30 PM—more than two-and-a-half hours later. Nothing in the record suggests that Shing attempted to secure alternate transportation or to contact the court to explain that she would be unable to attend the hearing.<sup>2</sup> Nor does she

---

<sup>2</sup> Although the record does not contain a transcript for the hearing, the hearing sheet does not indicate any explanation for Shing’s failure to appear.

contend otherwise. Under these circumstances, we cannot say that the court’s denial of Shing’s motion for new trial was “beyond the fringe of what [we] deem[] minimally acceptable.” *Andre J.*, 223 Md. App. at 323 (cleaned up). Thus, the court did not abuse its discretion, and we shall affirm its judgment.

**JUDGMENT OF THE CIRCUIT  
COURT FOR HOWARD COUNTY  
AFFIRMED. COSTS TO BE PAID BY  
APPELLANT.**