

UNREPORTED  
IN THE APPELLATE COURT  
OF MARYLAND

No. 1452

September Term, 2025

---

STARSHA M. SEWELL

v.

JOHN B. HOWARD

---

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

JJ.

---

PER CURIAM

---

Filed: June 23, 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.

Starsha Sewell, appellant, and John Howard, appellee, are the parents of two minor children. On July 29, 2014, the Circuit Court for Prince George’s County entered an order granting Mr. Howard sole legal and physical custody of the children; denying Ms. Sewell visitation; and ordering Ms. Sewell to pay child support. Thereafter, Ms. Sewell filed numerous motions to vacate the custody order pursuant to Maryland Rule 2-535(b), claiming that the circuit court had lacked jurisdiction to enter the custody order and that various parties involved in her case, including the judge, the Assistant State’s Attorney, the Prince George’s County Police Department, and the Department of Social Services, had engaged in fraudulent or discriminatory activity. The circuit court denied those motions in January 2018. Ms. Sewell appealed, and we affirmed, holding that the circuit court had jurisdiction to enter the 2014 custody order and that Ms. Sewell had failed to demonstrate the existence of any fraud, mistake, or irregularity that would have warranted the court vacating that judgment. *See Sewell v. Howard*, No. 2266, Sept. 2017 (filed August 31, 2018).

Undeterred, Ms. Sewell has continued to file motions to vacate the 2014 custody order and all directives issued by the circuit court to enforce that order. Ms. Sewell appealed from the denial of some of those motions, and in each instance, we affirmed, finding that her claims are barred by the law of the case doctrine. Ms. Sewell now appeals from the circuit court’s denial of one more such motion, her July 29, 2025, motion for contempt on plaintiff and its counsel and to vacate pursuant to Maryland Rule 2-535(b). On appeal, Ms. Sewell again claims that the court erred in denying that motion because the circuit court lacked jurisdiction to enter the 2014 custody order. As an initial matter, to the extent

appellant was attempting to hold appellee and his counsel in contempt, the denial of a motion for contempt is not appealable. *See Pack Shack, Inc. v. Howard Cnty.*, 371 Md. 243, 254 (2002) (holding that CJP § 12-304 does not allow a right to an appeal by “a party who unsuccessfully seeks to have another party held in contempt” (quotation marks and citation omitted)). As to appellant’s claim that the circuit court lacked jurisdiction to enter the custody order and its subsequent orders seeking to enforce the custody order, we have previously addressed that contention on appeal and held that it lacks merit. Consequently, Ms. Sewell’s claim is barred by the law of the case doctrine. *See Baltimore Cnty. v. Baltimore Cnty. Fraternal Ord. 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, citation, and emphasis omitted)).

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