

Circuit Court for Prince George's County
Case No.: C-16-FM-23-000387

UNREPORTED
IN THE APPELLATE COURT
OF MARYLAND*

No. 2083

September Term, 2023

ERICA TUCKER HAYGOOD

v.

BRANDON PARROTT, ET AL.

Graeff,
Leahy,
Kenney, James A., III
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

Opinion by Kenney, J.

Filed: June 3, 2025

*This is an unreported opinion. This opinion may not be cited as precedent within the rule of stare decisis. It may be cited for its persuasive value only if the citation conforms to Rule 1-104(a)(2)(B).

Appellant, Erica Tucker Haygood (“Mother”), who is self-represented, appeals an order of the Circuit Court for Prince George’s County denying her request for child support.

For the reasons set forth below, we affirm the judgment of the circuit court.

BACKGROUND

Mother and Brandon Parrott (“Father”) are the biological parents of two minor children: “M,” born in 2010, and “K,” born in 2012. On January 18, 2023, Anita Malone, the children’s maternal grandmother, filed for custody of M and K, who then lived with Mother. Ms. Malone based her custody complaint on Mother’s “drug and alcohol abuse and unsafe living envi[ro]nment” resulting from “Mother’s decisions.”

Mother answered Ms. Malone’s complaint and filed a counter-complaint for custody. Father, who was living in Ohio, also filed an answer and counter-complaint for custody. He stated that he was living in Ohio and that M and K had “always resided with [him] prior to 2018.” That ended when Mother persuaded a court in Ohio that he was not the children’s biological father and ordered him to return the children to her.¹ All three appeared for a pendente lite hearing on March 16, 2023. At that hearing, Ms. Malone and Father were granted temporary joint legal and physical custody of M and K.

Later, Ms. Malone filed a petition for contempt based on Father failing to return the children to her care following a visit. A hearing on Ms. Malone’s contempt petition was held on August 9, 2023. When Father failed to appear at that hearing, the court dismissed

¹ The record contained no additional information regarding the proceedings in Ohio.

both Ms. Malone’s and Father’s complaints for custody, and vacated the pendente lite order. It appears that Father maintained physical custody of the children.

At that hearing, the court also reset a hearing date of September 8, 2023 on Mother’s request for child support. That hearing date was extended at Mother’s request. On November 9, 2023, the circuit court denied Mother’s request for child support from Father “for failure to file a financial statement” pursuant to Md. Rule 9-203.

Another hearing on Mother’s counter-complaint for custody and child support was set for November 27, 2023. On November 22, 2023, Mother filed a financial statement pursuant to Rule 9-203(a) that included a statement of her income, monthly expenses, assets and liabilities. At the hearing on November 27, 2023, Mother and Father appeared without counsel; Ms. Malone did not appear. The court awarded Mother sole physical and legal custody of M and K. As to child support, the court asked Mother whether she had evidence of Father’s income. She responded that she had only “[o]ld royalty statements. That’s it.” In again denying her request for child support, the court stated: “[Mother] has the burden of proof of child support. I recommend that you file with the Office of Child Support. They can do the legwork, and they can figure out what he owes in child support, and he should file with them.”

Mother noted this timely appeal.

DISCUSSION

Title 12 of the Family Law Article (“F.L.”) of the Maryland Code (1984, 2019 Repl. Vol.) provides a comprehensive scheme for awarding child support to a custodial parent. *See Durkee v. Durkee*, 144 Md. App. 161, 182 (2002). F.L. § 12-202(a)(1) states that, “in

any proceeding to establish . . . child support, . . . the court shall use the child support guidelines set forth in this subtitle.” Those guidelines were established “based on specific descriptive and numeric criteria” and “result in a computation of the support obligation.” *Voishan v. Palma*, 327 Md. 318, 322 (1992) (quotation marks and citation omitted). To determine the parents’ financial obligations under the child support guidelines, “the court must consider ‘the actual adjusted income’ of each parent.” *Durkee*, 144 Md. App. at 182 (quoting *Reuter v. Reuter*, 102 Md. App. 212, 221 (1994)); see F.L. § 12-204(a)(1). “Actual income” is defined as “income from any source.” F.L. § 12-201(b)(1); see also *Guidash v. Tome*, 211 Md. App. 725, 745 (2013) (“Put plainly, the guidelines require that the court determine the parties’ monthly actual income, calculate the basic support amount, add certain child-related expenses to the basic support amount, and then allocate the total between the parents.”).

For that reason, F.L. § 12-203(b) requires income statements from the parents to be “verified with documentation of both current and past actual income.” *Ley v. Forman*, 144 Md. App. 658, 669 (2002). Here, Mother provided a financial statement without documentation such as tax returns or pay stubs verifying her income. Nor has Father filed a required financial statement, and Mother was unable to produce any evidence as to his income. It appears from the record that Mother attempted to serve Father with discovery, but the requests were returned as undeliverable based on an incorrect address.

The record also reflects an unsuccessful attempt to subpoena information regarding Father’s income from corporations in California and New York that included a motion in the circuit court for an order to compel the corporations’ compliance with her subpoena.

The circuit court, denying her motion, stated that it did not have “jurisdiction over non-party foreign corporations. To obtain jurisdiction, the subpoena must be issued and served pursuant to NY and California law. See New York’s and California’s versions of the Uniform Interstate Depositions and Discovery Act.”

The circuit court did not err in denying Mother’s request for child support because it did not have the required evidence of the parties’ actual income to award child support under the child support guidelines. To be sure, getting Father’s information is more complicated because he apparently does not live in Maryland, and other entities that may have information regarding his income are not in Maryland. If Mother is unable to procure legal assistance in this matter, she should consider, as the circuit court suggested, consulting the Prince George’s County Office of Child Support to assist her in obtaining child support from Father.

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