

Circuit Court for Prince George's County
Case No. CASR19-12932

UNREPORTED
IN THE APPELLATE COURT
OF MARYLAND

No. 1168

September Term, 2023

KEVIN DONTE BLAIR

v.

TYANA SHARRON HOLMES

Nazarian,
Reed,
Sharer, J. Frederick
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

PER CURIAM

Filed: April 5, 2024

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

Kevin Donte Blair, appellant, and Tyana Sharron Holmes, appellee, are the parents of K.H., a minor child. In June 2021, the Circuit Court for Prince George’s County issued an order requiring appellant to pay child support to appellee. Between March and July 2023, appellant filed three separate pleadings seeking to modify the child support order, and also to dismiss the child support action in its entirety. The motions were based, in part, on the fact that appellant had obtained full custody of the minor child in March 2023. However, appellant further claimed that the child support action should be dismissed in its entirety because the court did not have jurisdiction over him. Specifically, he asserted that he was a “living man” not a “private person . . . subjected to legal process” and therefore he was “unconditionally sovereign and independent of the claimed authority and unproven jurisdiction of the court.” Following a hearing before a Magistrate, the circuit court entered an order terminating appellant’s ongoing child support obligation, requiring him to continue paying any child support arrearages, and denying his motion to dismiss. This appeal followed.

As he did in the circuit court, appellant contends that the child support action should have been dismissed because the circuit court lacked jurisdiction. We disagree. The circuit court could exercise personal jurisdiction over appellant because the record indicates that he resides in Upper Marlboro, Maryland, and was served in Maryland with a copy of the summons and child support petition. *See* Cts. & Jud. Pro. Art. § 6-102(a) (“A court may exercise personal jurisdiction as to any cause of action over a person domiciled in, served with process in, organized under the laws of, or who maintains his principal place of business in the State.”). Moreover, Section 1-201 of the Family Law Article provides that

an equity court has jurisdiction over custody, visitation, and support of a child. FL § 1-201(b)(5), (6), (9). Thus, FL § 1-201 clearly conferred subject-matter jurisdiction on the Circuit Court for Prince George’s County to decide a case involving child support for appellant’s minor child.

In arguing otherwise, appellant asserts that he is a “free citizen of this state and cannot be commanded to come to court voluntarily” and that “before showing up inside a court building [he] has the right to demand from the clerk of the court to provide discovery evidence proving . . . evidence of an injury in fact caused by [him].” But these claims are wholly without merit and appear to be based on legal theories advanced by the proponents of the “sovereign citizen” movement, which we have noted “have not, will not, and cannot be accepted as valid.” *Anderson v. O’Sullivan*, 224 Md. App. 501, 512 (2015). Consequently, we hold that the circuit court did not err in denying appellant’s motion to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction.

**JUDGMENT OF THE CIRCUIT
COURT FOR PRINCE GEORGE’S
COUNTY AFFIRMED. COSTS TO BE
PAID BY APPELLANT.**