

Circuit Court for Calvert County
Case Nos.: C-04-FM-25-811027, 028

UNREPORTED
IN THE APPELLATE COURT
OF MARYLAND*

Nos. 1671 & 1672

September Term, 2025

ALLISON HOFF
v.
MICHAEL PEREZ

ALLISON HOFF
v.
MARIA PEREZ

Zic,
Tang,
Zarnoch, Robert A.
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

PER CURIAM

Filed: July 8, 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.

On August 25, 2025, Allison Hoff filed petitions for protective orders in the Circuit Court for Calvert County naming her ex-husband, Michael Perez, and her former mother-in-law, Maria Perez, as respondents. On September 2, 2025, the circuit court convened a hearing on the petitions and after considering the testimony and evidence before it denied Ms. Hoff’s requests for final protective orders. She appeals those judgments. We shall affirm.

On July 18, 2025, the circuit court—following a multi-day contested hearing—granted Ms. Hoff and Mr. Perez an absolute divorce and awarded Mr. Perez sole legal and physical custody of their minor son and awarded Ms. Hoff supervised visitation.¹ Less than a month later, Ms. Hoff filed the petitions for protective orders against Mr. Perez and Ms. Perez in which she sought protective orders and custody of the child.

As to Mr. Perez, Ms. Hoff testified generally that Mr. Perez “has a history of physical and verbal violence against” her and their child, then two and one-half years old. She claimed that, while pregnant in 2022, Mr. Perez “made [her] fall twice” and, rather than help her get up, “stood over” her and “berated” her. She claimed that he “threatened” her on “multiple occasions” that if she “ever called 911 he would leave” her because he would lose his job as a police officer with the Metropolitan Police Department of Washington, D.C. She did, however, call 911 in the midst of an argument on January 1, 2024 when she claimed that, while in the shower, Mr. Perez “accosted” her and when she

¹ Ms. Hoff appealed. This Court affirmed the custody award, but we reversed and remanded for additional proceedings related to the division of marital property. *Hoff v. Perez*, No. 1280, September Term, 2025 (filed unreported on April 27, 2026).

tried to exit, he chased her and “physically cornered” her and pushed her up against the dresser. She also claimed that Mr. Perez took her phone from her as she tried to call for help and “pried” their infant from her arms. She testified that Ms. Perez “was on the phone on speaker and she was belligerent and screaming” at her that she could not leave and take the child. Ms. Hoff further related that her friends, Brittany Litke and Travis Charette, arrived on the scene but she did not leave with them because, although Mr. Perez said she could leave, she could not take the child with her.

Mr. Perez denied the allegations. He also submitted the bodycam footage of the officers (Calvert County Sheriff’s Department) who responded to the 911 call. In that video, Ms. Hoff is seen conversing with the officer and informing him that she and her husband were “having a spat” and he “started following, swearing at me” and “tried to grab” the baby from her arms. She apologized for calling 911. She denied being “injured in any way” and denied any physical altercations other than Mr. Perez trying to take the baby. Although the video captured the officer informing Ms. Hoff that she could file a petition for a protective order, at the final protective order hearing she denied hearing that and asserted that it was only recently that she learned that was “an option.” She also claimed that she deliberately withheld information from the officers to protect her then husband from losing his job.

The video also recorded the officer’s conversation with Mr. Perez, who confirmed that he had told his wife she could leave, but not with the child. Mr. Perez also told the officer that he believed his wife was “suffering from postpartum depression” and she had

“already broken down the door” and done “other stuff.” He expressed that he did not “think she’s fit sometimes to take care” of the child.

Ms. Hoff also alleged that on Mother’s Day, May 12, 2024, in the midst of another argument, Mr. Perez “ripped” the baby out of her arms because she wanted to go to church instead of the aquarium. She admitted on cross-examination, however, that on that morning she went out to breakfast with the child and sent her husband a photograph of herself and the son. Mr. Perez testified that the family also went to a Thai restaurant in Virginia that evening. Although Ms. Hoff recalled going to dinner at that restaurant, she could not recall the date. Ms. Hoff acknowledged that on August 12, 2024, the court issued an emergency custody order granting Mr. Perez custody of their son after she was involuntarily committed at Anne Arundel Medical Center.

As to Ms. Perez, her former mother-in-law, Ms. Hoff testified about two incidents. The first was during the January 1, 2024 argument with her husband, during which Ms. Hoff claimed that Ms. Perez “was on the phone on speaker and she was belligerent and screaming” at her that she could not leave and take the child. The second incident occurred on July 4, 2025, during a “custodial transfer.” Ms. Perez met Ms. Hoff to exchange the child with Ms. Perez doing the pick-up in place of her son, Mr. Perez, who was working. Ms. Hoff claimed that Ms. Perez “pried [the child] out of [her] arms while berating” her and “screaming” at her and “carried” the child to her vehicle and placed him there, all the while still “berating” her.

Ms. Perez denied all the allegations levied against her. As to the July 4th incident, she related that the child was sleeping throughout the entire exchange, and she denied using

any “force to take the child” from Ms. Hoff’s arms. She denied threatening Ms. Hoff during that exchange, and further denied screaming at her over the phone on January 1, 2024.

As to the protective order request against Ms. Perez, the court concluded that there was no credible evidence that Ms. Perez “made any threat or any injury or anything of that nature against Ms. Hoff.” The court further found “no evidence that Ms. Perez committed any assault, made any threats of bodily harm or imminent bodily harm against Ms. Hoff.” The court, therefore, concluded that Ms. Hoff “failed to meet her burden of proof” and denied the request for a final protective order.

As to the protective order request against Mr. Perez, the court reviewed the evidence related to the January 1, 2024 incident and found that Mr. Perez’s statements to the police recorded on the bodycam were consistent with his statements in court whereas Ms. Hoff’s statements were inconsistent. As for the Mother’s Day incident, the judge stated that he was “not even clear on what the allegation is there.” The court determined that there was “no evidence that any abuse or threats of abuse occurred on that date either.” As to Ms. Hoff’s general allegations of a history of abuse, the court found nothing to sustain a finding of abuse. Consequently, the court concluded that Ms. Hoff had “not met her burden of proof” and denied the request for a final protective order against Mr. Perez.

On appeal, Ms. Hoff (who represents herself, as she did at the protective order hearing) raises a host of allegations. First, she asserts that the judge who presided over the protective order case “display[ed] bias towards law enforcement by continually accepting testimony as fact by [Mr. Perez] when they are lies.” She also asserts that the court was

biased in favor of Mr. Perez’s counsel “by continually upholding [counsel’s] objections and cutting off” her own testimony. She also claims that the court failed to follow “standards of judgeship that look at battered women as emotionally traumatized like war.”

We have reviewed the transcript in this case, as well as the exhibits submitted at the hearing. We have read Ms. Hoff’s brief. We find no merit to any of her broad-ranging allegations. Moreover, some of the “facts” she asserts on appeal were not elicited in the circuit court, and we see nothing in the record before us that Ms. Hoff raised the battered woman syndrome.

Her contention that the trial judge was biased was not preserved for appellate review as Ms. Hoff never raised the issue in the circuit court or requested that the trial judge recuse himself. To preserve the issue, she was required to file a timely motion with the trial judge. *Conwell Law v. Tung*, 221 Md. App. 481, 516 (2015). “A timely motion is one that is filed as soon as the basis for it becomes known and relevant and is not one that represents the possible withholding of a recusal motion as a weapon to use only in the event of some unfavorable ruling.” *Id.* (cleaned up). Because Ms. Hoff never made such a motion in the circuit court, she has waived the issue for appeal. *Id.* at 516-17.

In any event, there is simply nothing in the record before us that suggests that the court in this case was biased or rendered a decision based on anything but the evidence properly before it.

**JUDGMENTS OF THE CIRCUIT COURT
FOR CALVERT COUNTY AFFIRMED.
COSTS TO BE PAID BY APPELLANT.**