

Circuit Court for Montgomery County  
Case No. 427991V

UNREPORTED  
IN THE COURT OF SPECIAL APPEALS  
OF MARYLAND

No. 948

September Term, 2020

---

DEBRA BONILLA-MEAD

v.

HSBC MORTGAGE SERVICES, INC. NY, *et*  
*al.*

---

Fader, C.J,  
Ripken,  
Kenney, James A., III  
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

---

PER CURIAM

---

Filed: September 10, 2021

\*This is an unreported opinion, and it may not be cited in any paper, brief, motion, or other document filed in this Court or any other Maryland Court as either precedent within the rule of stare decisis or as persuasive authority. Md. Rule 1-104.

In 2016, Debra Bonilla-Mead, appellant, filed a complaint in the Circuit Court for Montgomery County against HSBC Mortgage Services, Inc. NY (HSBC); Deutsche Bank Trust Company Americas, as Trustee for Residential Accredit Loans, Inc., Mortgage Asset Backed Pass-Through Certificates, Series 2006-QS17 (Deutsche Bank); PHH Mortgage (PHH); and McCabe, Weisburg & Conway, LLC (McCabe).<sup>1</sup> In that complaint, Ms. Bonilla-Mead sought to quiet title to real property located at 19705 Greenside Terrace, Gaithersburg, Maryland, claiming that any action to foreclose the property by appellees was barred by the statute of limitations. She also alleged that appellees had engaged in a civil conspiracy to unlawfully foreclose on the property.

The court granted McCabe’s motion to dismiss the complaint in April 2017; granted Deutsche Bank and PHH’s motion to dismiss the complaint in May 2017; and dismissed the complaint as to HSBC on October 28, 2019. Thereafter, Ms. Bonilla-Mead filed a notice of appeal raising three issues: (1) whether the court “abuse[d] its jurisdiction and authority by denying [her] right to a jury as demanded in [her] bill of complaint”; (2) whether the court lacked the authority to “hold[ ] the proceedings of October 28, 2019, and to dismiss her complaint” because she had an appeal pending in this Court; and (3) whether the “master audio transcript of [the October 28, 2019] proceedings has been heavily redacted in favor of appellees.” We held that these claims lacked merit and affirmed the

---

<sup>1</sup> HSBC was appellant’s mortgage lender, Deutsche Bank was the holder of the Note securing the Deed of Trust, PHH was the servicer of the mortgage loan, and McCabe had represented HSBC.

judgment of the circuit court. *See Bonilla-Mead v. HSBC Mortgage Services, Inc. NY, et al.*, No. 1757, Sept. Term 2019 (filed December 17, 2020).

After the mandate issued, Ms. Bonilla-Mead continued to file various motions in the circuit court, most of which are extremely difficult to follow. Relevant to this appeal, she filed (1) a “Motion for Court to Strike and Reconsider its Alleged Order of July 14, 2020 Denying Plaintiff’s Relief Requested On an Alleged Deficiency Under MD Rule 1-323 on August 4, 2020”; (2) a “Motion to the Chief Clerk of the Court Barbara Meiklejohn to Investigate Mishandling of the Courts Official Docket and Official File Jacket Which Appears to Have Been Tampered With on August 12, 2020”; and (3) a “Motion to Strike and Vacate All Orders of this Court Including Docket Entries 154-157 on the Grounds that the Court Has Been Deceived by Joshua Wellborn Presenting the Court and Plaintiff with a False Address.” The court entered separate orders denying each of these motions. This appeal followed.

Although Ms. Bonilla-Mead is purportedly appealing from the court’s orders denying her post-judgment motions, she does not raise any specific claims of error with respect to those orders. Therefore, we will not consider on appeal whether the court erred in denying those motions. *See Diallo v. State*, 413 Md. 678, 692-93 (2010) (noting that arguments that are “not presented with particularity will not be considered on appeal” (citation omitted)).

Ms. Bonilla-Mead does raise several issues in her brief unrelated to her post-judgment motions. But those issues are, verbatim, the same issues that she raised in her prior appeal from the circuit court’s order dismissing her complaint. And we have already

addressed those claims and held that they lacked merit. Consequently, they are barred by the law of the case doctrine. *See Baltimore County v. Baltimore County Fraternal Order of Police, Lodge No. 4*, 220 Md. App. 596, 659 (2014) (noting that “neither the questions decided [by the appellate courts] nor the ones that could have been raised and decided are available to be raised in a subsequent appeal” (quotation marks and citation omitted)).

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