Circuit Court for Montgomery County
Case No. C-15-CV-22-004437

UNREPORTED

IN THE APPELLATE COURT

OF MARYLAND

No. 948

September Term, 2025

PIERCE E. VANLI

v.

RICHARD SOLOMON, *et al*.

Friedman,
Kehoe, S.,
Kenney, James A., III
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

PER CURIAM

Filed: May 27, 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.

Pierce E. Vanli, appellant, appeals from an order issued by the Circuit Court for Montgomery County denying his motions for a temporary restraining order and a preliminary injunction, wherein he sought to stay the foreclosure sale of his property.[1] On appeal he raises four issues, which reduce to one: whether the court erred in denying his motions to stay the foreclosure sale. For the reasons that follow, we shall affirm.

In December 2022, appellees, the substitute trustees,[2] filed an Order to Docket foreclosure seeking to foreclose on real property owned by appellant. The final loss mitigation affidavit was filed in January 2023, and appellant requested mediation. A mediation was held on July 18, 2023, but no agreement was reached.

Appellant filed a suggestion of bankruptcy in September 2023, and the bankruptcy stay was lifted on February 15, 2024. He then filed a second suggestion of bankruptcy on April 2, 2024. That stay was lifted on May 9, 2025. On June 24, 2025, appellant filed motions for a temporary restraining order and for a preliminary injunction, claiming that: (1) he was disputing the amount of the payoff and reinstatement quotes provided by the lender; (2) the lender had failed to provide him with loan information in accordance with the terms of the security instrument; (3) the lender had blocked his online access to his loan account; (4) the lender forced him "to purchase overpriced homeowner's insurance"; (5)

[1] Appellant also indicates that he is appealing from the court's August 7, 2025, order to proceed, and October 24, 2025, order denying his September 26, 2025, motion for reconsideration and to remove improperly named party. Appellant's notice of appeal, however, was filed on July 7, 2025, and thus premature as to both those orders. Consequently, we shall not consider issues raised by appellant with respect to those orders.

[2] Appellees are Richard Solomon, Richard J. Rogers, Kathleen Young, Michael McKeefery, Christianna Kersey, Kyle Blackstone, and Kevin Hildebeidel.

the lender had "improperly handled a legitimate insurance claim for roof damage"; and (6) he had unspecified "concerns regarding potential discrimination during the loan modification process[.]" The court denied those motions without a hearing, finding that he had "not adequately set forth facts indicating the likelihood that [he] will succeed on the merits[.]" This appeal followed.

Although appellant captioned his motions as seeking a temporary protective order and a preliminary injunction, procedurally, motions seeking to stay or dismiss a foreclosure sale are governed by Maryland Rule 14-211, rather than Rules 15-504 and 15-505. *See Hood v. Driscoll*, 227 Md. App. 689, 693-94 (2016). Because appellant requested foreclosure mediation, and the request was not stricken, any motion to stay was thus required to be filed with 15 days after the date the postfile mediation was held. Md. Rule 14-211(a)(2)(A)(iii). The plain language of that rule further provides that the circuit court "shall" deny the motion if it was not timely filed, and the movant did not show good cause for excusing non-compliance. Md. Rule 14-211(b).

Here, appellant's motions to stay were untimely, as they were filed almost two years after the postfile mediation was held. And in those motions, appellant did not set forth any cause, much less "good cause," for why the motions had not been timely filed.[3] The court,

[3] In his reply brief, appellant asserts that he could not have filed his motions to stay within the time required by Rule 14-211 because his case had been stayed by the Bankruptcy Court. However, his first suggestion of bankruptcy was filed approximately two months after the postfile mediation occurred. Moreover, more than 40 days elapsed between the time the last bankruptcy stay was lifted and the time that he filed his motions to stay. Thus, the pendency of his bankruptcy case did not prevent him from filing a motion to stay or dismiss within 15 days of postfile mediation.

therefore, did not abuse its discretion in denying both motions for that reason alone. Although appellant notes that the court did not address timeliness in its order, an appellate court may affirm a judgment "where the record in a case adequately demonstrates that the decision of the trial court was correct, although on a ground not relied upon by the trial court[.]" *Robeson v. State*, 285 Md. 498, 502 (1979). As the record demonstrates that appellant's motions did not comply with Rule 14-211, we shall affirm the judgment.

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