

UNREPORTED*

IN THE APPELLATE COURT

OF MARYLAND

No. 2106

September Term, 2025

AMATULLAH BOOTH-BLACKMAN

v.

DUANE GORDON BLACKMAN

Nazarian,
Ripken,
Beachley, Donald E.,
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

Opinion by Ripken, J.

Filed: May 20, 2026

This appeal arises as a result of a lengthy divorce and custody proceeding between Amatullah Booth-Blackman (“Mother”), appellant, and Duane Gordon Blackman (“Father”), appellee. In December of 2021, Mother filed a complaint for custody of the parties’ two shared children, in which she sought primary physical custody, joint legal custody with tie-breaking authority, child support from the date of filing of the complaint, and costs and fees. The following month, in January of 2022, Father filed an answer and a counter-complaint for limited divorce, custody, and child support. On May 26, 2022, the court entered a Consent Custody and Access Order, granting Mother primary physical custody of the children and ordering Father to pay \$1,270 monthly for pendente lite child support. In September of 2022, the court entered an order directing the issues of permanent child support, arrears, and fees to be heard at the parties’ divorce merits trial. Due to the numerous pre-trial motions and additional proceedings, the final trial on the merits did not occur until June of 2024.

Following a three-day trial on the merits, the Circuit Court for Montgomery County granted the parties an absolute divorce; ordered Father to pay Mother \$3,063 monthly as child support; denied Mother’s request for retroactive child support and arrears; and denied both parties’ requests for awards of attorneys’ fees and expenses.

Regarding the court’s child support order, Mother, following the denial of her post-judgment motions, noted an appeal to this Court. Her appeal was dismissed, and she subsequently petitioned for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Maryland, which was denied in August of 2025. On October 2, 2025, more than one year after the child support order was entered, Mother filed a motion to revise or vacate the court’s child

support order and accompanying judgments “based on multiple instances of fraud, mistake, irregularity, and failure of court employees to perform required duties” (the “Motion to Revise”). Mother requested a hearing on the motion.

On the morning of November 4, 2024, Mother filed an addendum to her Motion to Revise (the “addendum”), seeking, among other things, recusal of the trial judge who entered the June 2024 orders from consideration of the motion. Later that afternoon, the court, “having determined that a hearing [was] unnecessary for the [m]otion’s adjudication,” signed an order denying the Motion to Revise. The order was entered on the docket two days later, on November 6, 2025.

Mother then noted this timely appeal, presenting the following issue for our review:¹

Whether the circuit court erred in denying Mother’s Motion to Revise.

For the reasons to follow, we shall affirm the judgment of the circuit court.

¹ Rephrased and consolidated from:

- A. Whether the trial court erred in denying [Mother’s] Motion to Revise or Vacate Judgment without affording [Mother] a hearing on her motion, as requested in her motion[.]
- B. Whether the trial court erred in failing to address [Mother’s] motion requesting recusal[.] before ruling on the underlying Motion to Revise or Vacate Judgment[.]
- C. Whether the trial court erred in denying [Mother’s] Motion to Revise or Vacate Judgment when [Mother] alleged grounds of fraud, mistake, irregularity, and failure of court employees to perform required duties under Maryland Courts and Judicial Proceedings Code § 6-408[.]

FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

The following facts were adduced at trial or from the record. Mother and Father were married in September of 2019. The couple had two children, one born prior to the marriage and the other during the marriage. The parties separated in September of 2021.

In December of 2021, Mother filed a complaint for custody, in which she sought primary physical custody, joint legal custody with tie-breaking authority, child support from the date of filing, and costs and fees with the Circuit Court for Montgomery County.² Father filed an answer as well as a counter-complaint seeking a limited divorce, custody, and child support. On May 26, 2022, the court entered a consent custody and access order, granting Mother primary physical custody of the children and ordering Father to pay \$1,270 monthly for pendente lite child support. The parties jointly moved to consolidate and postpone the custody merits hearing; hence, on September 28, 2022, the court ordered that the issues of permanent child support, arrears, and fees were to be heard at the parties' divorce merits trial.

Both Mother and Father filed numerous motions resulting in significant pre-trial litigation. The divorce merits trial commenced on June 4, 2024. At the trial on the merits, Mother appeared *pro se*³ and Father appeared with counsel. Both parties presented evidence and argument. At the conclusion of the three-day proceeding, the court announced

² Mother later amended this complaint to additionally seek absolute divorce or, in the alternative, a limited divorce.

³ Mother is an attorney, although she was not licensed to practice law in the State of Maryland at the time of the trial.

that an oral ruling would be issued at a later date.

On June 20, 2024, the court gave an oral ruling, granting the parties an absolute divorce and addressing both parties' various petitions for alimony and modification of custody. Finally, the court addressed Mother's request for child support and arrears. Mother requested arrearages to cover "the children's childcare expenses and other related expenses from the time [she] left the marriage." The court inquired into what evidence supported Mother's claim for arrears, and the following colloquy ensued:

THE COURT: What evidence did you produce to support that claim?

[MOTHER]: I submitted receipts and also OurFamilyWizard app messages that indicate that defendant was aware of these arrearages, as well as the . . . proof of the payroll payments that I made to the nanny, Marina But yes, I submitted several receipts and documentation proving and establishing the proof of my payment to child-related expenses that the defendant did not contribute to.

THE COURT: What exhibit numbers were those, please?

[MOTHER]: I don't have those in front of me, and I tried to go through the exhibits during the trial, but I was never able to get through all of them because of the time restraints.

THE COURT: Okay. So I'm looking, and you have 47 exhibits that were identified, some of which were received in evidence, some were not. I don't see anything that would include receipts and other things in your request for child support arrears or anything of that nature.

[MOTHER]: Well, I guess as a matter -- the child support has to be adjusted based on the income of the parties.

THE COURT: That –

[MOTHER]: And as you state[d] at the beginning of the trial that once the child support was established, it would go retroactive for the time period, depending on what our income was during those different time periods. So that, as an initial matter, those arrearages have not been calculated. But

additionally, these are expenses that I know are in the record because I didn't have time to record all of the numbers and as it related to what was in the record, but I did go through the record to find out what was not admitted, and I know that the only things that were not admitted were the -- pretty much the counsel fees and retainer that I did introduce into evidence but was not—and tried to get into evidence, but it was not -- it never made it actually into evidence. But those receipts are in evidence.

THE COURT: So these --

[MOTHER]: There's --

THE COURT: Okay. So ma'am, the custody order that goes back to May 26, 2022, more than two years ago, says on page 14 that the only issues remaining are child support[[][,] child support arrears if any exist which are reserved for the custody marriage trial scheduled for October 17 through 20, 2022, almost two years ago. What happened --

[MOTHER]: Yes.

THE COURT: -- is this the only custody merits trial that's happened just this month?

[MOTHER]: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So ma'am, again, we make decisions based upon evidence.

[MOTHER]: Yes.

THE COURT: The order, two paragraphs above the one that I just read, says, "Pursuant to the child support guidelines commencing June 1, 2022, and continuing on the first day of the month thereafter, [Father] shall directly pay to [Mother] \$1,270 as pendente lite support for the minor children." And it says, "The income figures used to determine child support are expressly understood to be temporary and are subject to further order of court or agreement between the parties."

To make the determination that you're now asking about, I would need to know everything that he paid from June 21, 2022, through today. Period of two years. I'd need to know everything that he's paid. I don't recall any testimony about what he's paid since then. So that would be one

evidentiary deficiency.

Another would be the parties' incomes over those two years. I don't recall you presenting evidence that would support what your income was during that period of time. Because this would be a new determination. What was in place was [pendente lite]. And so obviously anything that he paid, he would be entitled to credit for and against whatever the ultimate amount was. And [Mother], it would be multiple support determinations because we're talking a period of a couple of years. And so I would need to have the financial data to make those determinations. I don't find that you presented that evidence for me to make that determination. It's your burden to prove that [as] you're the party requesting child support. I don't think that [Father] has requested child support. It's you and it's your burden to do that.

So I'm not awarding any [retroactive] child support today. If you think I'm wrong, you have 30 days to move to alter or amend my judgment, and I'll do that. I'll reconsider it if you can convince me that you've presented evidence that would support your claims for child support. But frankly, I don't think you produced that evidence. It's based upon the evidence that would be in the record. So you're going to need to file a motion and raise my attention, point out what exhibits you produced, what testimony you provided that would support your child support claims.

In further clarification as to why the court was not awarding retroactive child support, as requested by Mother, the court explained that:

THE COURT: Because you've asked for it retroactive to the first request that you made for it. I would need to know what the incomes of both parties were and . . . I need to know about health insurance. I need to know about childcare. All those things are pieces of evidence that I require in order to calculate the amount of any child support and make a determination about whether this is a case that comes . . . within the child support guidelines or if it's above the child support guidelines. I don't have that information available. It wasn't presented in trial. You would need to present that information. But, if you think it's in the record, you can file your motion to alter or amend the judgment. Tell me where it is in the record. Whether it's testimonial evidence, whether it's documentary evidence, whether it's video, whether it's audio, whatever it is, you can point it out to me, and I'll go back and review and reconsider my decision. But I can't just do that now. You tell me, this is what I did, but you're not able to give me any specifics. I'm going to give you that opportunity to give those specifics if you can do it. Keep in mind that I make my decisions, again, based on the evidence that's in the

record.

Father’s counsel asked if he was “correct in understanding that there’s no longer a child support obligation on [his] client[.]” The court responded: “There’s no new child support obligation. He is obligated to have paid the [\$]1,270 [pendente lite] support.”

The court entered judgment of absolute divorce on June 26, 2024, in which the court denied Mother’s request for alimony and both parties’ requests for monetary awards, equitable division of property by the court, and expenses and fees. The next day, on June 27, 2024, a separate child support order was entered requiring Father to pay Mother \$3,063 monthly as child support; denying Mother’s requests for retroactive child support and arrears; and denying both parties’ requests for awards of attorneys’ fees and expenses (the “Child Support Order”).

Following the court’s decision, Mother filed a motion to consider newly discovered evidence and amend the June 2024 rulings and Child Support Order. The court conducted a two-day hearing on the matter, on September 18, 2024 and October 28, 2024. Subsequently, the court denied Mother’s motion on December 5, 2024. Mother filed an appeal to this court, which was dismissed in May of 2025 for Mother’s failure to file a brief. Mother then filed a petition for a writ of certiorari on the issue to the Supreme Court of Maryland, which was denied in August of 2025.

Mother filed the Motion to Revise on October 2, 2025. In the motion, Mother requested the circuit court to revise or vacate “the oral and written judgments entered on June 20, 2024, June 26, 2024, June 27, 2024, September 18, 2024, October 28, 2024, and

December 4, 2024,” pursuant to the Courts and Judicial Proceedings Article (“CJP”) of the Maryland Code, section 6-408, and Maryland Rule 2-535.

On the morning of November 4, 2024, Mother filed an addendum request to her Motion to Revise (the “addendum request”), seeking recusal of the trial judge who entered the June 2024 orders from consideration of the motion. Later that afternoon, the court, “having determined that a hearing is unnecessary for the [m]otion’s adjudication,” signed an order denying the Motion to Revise. The order was entered on the docket two days later, on November 6, 2025. The court did not separately address the addendum which had been filed as part of the Motion prior to the Court’s ruling.

Mother noted this timely appeal. Additional facts are included below as relevant.

DISCUSSION

THE CIRCUIT COURT DID NOT ERR IN DENYING MOTHER’S MOTION TO REVISE OR VACATE JUDGMENT.

A. Party Contentions

Mother contends that the trial court erred in denying her Motion to Revise because fraud, mistake, irregularity, and court employees’ failure to perform their required duties affected the original ruling. Mother claims that the court’s denial of the Motion to Revise without a hearing, as she requested, was error sufficient to allow revision under Maryland Rule 2-535. Mother also asserts that the lack of a hearing on the Motion to Revise denied her the “right to present evidence supporting the serious allegations underlying her motion.” Finally, Mother posits that the trial court erred in failing to address her addendum

request for recusal before ruling on the Motion to Revise. Father did not file a brief in this appeal.

B. Standard of Review

On appeal, the question of whether the proceedings underlying a motion to vacate or revise constitute cognizable fraud, mistake, irregularity, or failure of the court to perform is “a purely legal one[.]” *In re: Adoption/Guardianship No. 93321055/CAD*, 344 Md. 458, 475 n.5 (1997). Therefore, “[w]e review a circuit court’s determination of” that question “for clear error and legal correctness.” *Davis v. Attorney General*, 187 Md. App. 110, 124 (2009) (citing *In re: Adoption/Guardianship No. 93321055/CAD*, 344 Md. at 475–76 n.5).

If fraud, mistake, irregularity, or failure of the court to perform its duties existed as a matter of law, we then “review the court’s exercise of discretion to vacate the judgment . . . for abuse.” *Id.* (citing *Bland v. Hammond*, 177 Md. App. 340, 347 (2007); *Wells v. Wells*, 168 Md. App. 382, 394 (2006)). “The abuse of discretion standard makes generous allowances for the trial court’s reasoning.” *Das v. Das*, 133 Md. App. 1, 15 (2000).

C. Analysis

i. Fraud, Mistake, Irregularity, or Failure of the Court or Clerk’s Office

Under CJP section 6-408, the court has revisory power over its judgments for thirty days after entry. During that time, if a party files a motion to revise the judgment, the court has discretion to do so. *Id.* Beyond thirty days following the entry of the judgment at issue, the court has revisory power and control over the judgment “only in the case of fraud, mistake, irregularity, or failure of an employee of the court or of the clerk’s office to

perform a duty required by statute or rule.” *Id.* Maryland Rule 2-535 reiterates this paradigm, dictating that “[o]n motion of any party filed within 30 days after entry of judgment, the court may exercise revisory power and control over the judgment”; however, “[o]n motion of any party filed at any time, the court may exercise revisory power and control over the judgment in case of fraud, mistake, or irregularity.” *Compare* Md. Rule 2-535(a)–(b) *with* CJP § 6-408.

Here, Mother’s Motion to Revise was filed more than one year after the entry of the child support order on June 20, 2024, and almost ten months after the entry of the latest judgment referenced in the Motion to Revise. Thus, our review turns on whether there was fraud, mistake, irregularity, or failure of the court or clerk’s office to perform. *See* Md. Rule 2-535(b); CJP § 6-408.

Fraud

In the context of revisory motions, fraud is “narrowly defined and strictly applied.” *Das*, 133 Md. App. at 18 (citation omitted). Maryland courts may only grant revision under Rule 2-535(b) and CJP section 6-408 for extrinsic fraud. *Id.* Extrinsic fraud is “fraud which is collateral to the issues tried in the case where the judgment is rendered.” *Hresko v. Hresko*, 83 Md. App. 228, 232 (1990) (brackets and citations omitted). “In determining whether or not extrinsic fraud exists, the question is not whether the fraud operated to cause the trier of fact to reach an unjust conclusion, but whether the fraud prevented the actual dispute from being submitted to the fact finder at all.” *Das*, 133 Md. App. at 18–19 (citations omitted) (noting that extrinsic fraud may exist where there was “a false promise of a compromise; or where the defendant never had knowledge of the suit, being kept in

ignorance by the acts of the plaintiff; or where an attorney fraudulently or without authority assumes to represent a party and connives at his defeat; or where the attorney regularly employed corruptly sells out his client’s interest to the other side”).

In contrast, intrinsic fraud—which does not allow for the grant of untimely revisory motions—is “that which pertains to issues involved in the original action or where acts constituting fraud were, or could have been, litigated therein.” *Hresko*, 83 Md. App. at 232 (brackets and citation omitted). Intrinsic fraud occurs within the case itself—such as when witnesses perjure themselves or when a party offers a forged instrument into evidence—and hence is better left to the adversarial system for “fettering out such deception.” *Das*, 133 Md. App. at 18.

In Mother’s Motion to Revise, she asserted that Father engaged in fraud by “willfully withholding updated financial information from the [c]ourt[.]” purposely depleting his funds while claiming to be unable to pay child support, submitting outdated financial statements, and withholding information about his relocation out of state.⁴ These alleged actions, even if true, are not the type of actions that “prevented the actual dispute from being submitted to the fact finder[.]” *Das*, 133 Md. App. at 18. Hence, Mother’s claims refer only to intrinsic fraud and, “[e]ven if a perpetrator of intrinsic fraud occasionally succeeds in distorting the truth, our adversarial system is the best hope for ferreting out such deception.” *Id.* Thus, the circuit court did not have discretion to grant the

⁴ We combine and rephrase Mother’s contentions for clarity but retain the substance of each of her assertions.

Motion to Revise on grounds of fraud and the court’s denial of the motion was legally correct.

Mistake

We turn next to Mother’s allegation of mistake. Under Rule 2-535 and CJP section 6-408, mistake is limited to jurisdictional error. *Claibourne v. Willis*, 347 Md. 684, 692 (1997); *Green v. Ford Motor Credit Co.*, 152 Md. App. 32, 51–52 (2003) (noting that no mistake under Rule 2-535 existed where the trial court had subject matter jurisdiction to enter the judgment that it did).

Here, Mother claims that the court’s judgments contain “multiple legal and factual mistakes that warrant revision,” including: concluding that the pendente lite support order was superseded by the final support order, finding a lack of evidence to support child support arrears, finding that Father was unemployed for a period of time, calculating child support incorrectly, and finding that Mother was self-supporting. None of these assertions are jurisdictional errors, as none claim that the court did not have the jurisdiction to issue the ruling; rather, the assertions take issue with the substance of the ruling itself. For that reason, the circuit court did not have discretion to grant the Motion to Revise on grounds of mistake and the court’s denial was legally correct. *Green*, 152 Md. App. at 51–52.

Irregularity

As to irregularity, in the context of revisory motions, an irregularity is “the doing or not doing of that, in the conduct of a suit at law, which, conformable to the practice of the court, ought or ought not to be done.” *Autobahn Motors, Inc. v. Mayor and City Council*, 321 Md. 558, 562 (1991) (quoting *Weitz v. MacKenzie*, 273 Md. 628, 631 (1975)); *see also*

Hughes v. Beltway Homes, Inc., 276 Md. 382, 388 (1975); *Minger v. State*, 157 Md. App. 157, 169 (2004). In other words, an irregularity is “not an error, which in legal parlance, generally connotes a departure from truth or accuracy of which a party had notice and could have challenged, but a nonconformity of process or procedure.” *Davis*, 187 Md. App. at 125 (citations, brackets, and internal quotation marks omitted).

For example, this Court has found that no irregularity existed where the rule under which a motion was filed did not entitle the petitioner to a hearing and the motion was adjudicated without a hearing. *Das*, 133 Md. App. at 24–26. Likewise, here, Mother contended in her motion to the circuit court that irregularity existed because her various motions were denied without a hearing, the court precluded her from admitting certain exhibits into evidence, and the court denied her motion to modify “based on the [c]ourt’s improper personal assumptions[.]” Mother’s assertions regarding evidence and the court’s “assumptions” do not refer to process or procedure that fall under Rule 2-535. *See Minger*, 157 Md. App. at 169–70 (citations omitted). We briefly discuss Mother’s claims regarding her right to a hearing as an irregularity.

Under Maryland Rule 2-311(e), the court is required to determine whether a hearing is to be held, and cannot *grant* the motion without a hearing, when the motion is filed pursuant to Rule 2-532, 2-533, or 2-534. For all other motions, a party desiring a hearing “shall request the hearing” and “[e]xcept when a rule expressly provides for a hearing, the court shall determine in each case whether a hearing will be held, but the court may not render a decision that is dispositive of a claim or defense without a hearing if one was requested[.]” Md. Rule 2-311(f). “For a decision to be deemed dispositive of a claim or

defense” thus requiring the trial court to hold a hearing before rendering decision, “it must actually and formally dispose of claim or defense.” *Shelton v. Kirson*, 119 Md. App. 325, 330 (1998).

While Mother did file a motion pursuant to Rule 2-534, the court was not required to hold a hearing on that motion because the court ultimately denied the motion. Md. Rule 2-311(e) (“When a motion is filed pursuant to Rule 2-532, 2-533, or 2-534, the court shall determine in each case whether a hearing will be held, but it *may not grant the motion without a hearing.*” (Emphasis added)). Thus, absent an express provision for a hearing by rule, the court was only required to hold a hearing on the motion if the decision was dispositive of the claim or defense. *See Shelton*, 119 Md. App. at 330; Md. Rule 2-311(f); *see also Miller v. Mathias*, 428 Md. 419, 441 (2012).

In the circuit court, Mother asserted that the basis for irregularity was the court’s dismissal of her “various motions and pleadings without affording [Mother] a hearing despite her explicit requests for hearings[.]”⁵ Mother did not specify to which motions she referred; however, she requested a hearing on her motion seeking to modify the court’s prior orders regarding pendente lite child support, alimony, and contempt. The Maryland Rules do not require a hearing for such relief, and the denials of such motions for modification are not dispositive of the claim or defense because the order “merely refuse[s] to change [the court’s] original ruling” that was dispositive of the claim or defense.

⁵ Mother does not raise these grounds directly on appeal, but instead claims that there was irregularity in the court’s denial of the overarching Motion to Revise, which itself addressed those motions, without the requested hearing. We discuss that assertion *supra*.

Lowman v. Consolidated Rail Corp., 68 Md. App. 64, 75 (1986); *McDermott v. BB&T Bankcard Corp.*, 185 Md. App. 156, 170 n.9 (2009) (noting that Maryland Rule 2-311(f) “does not require a circuit court to hold a hearing on a motion to reconsider even if the initial ruling was on a dispositive motion”).

Therefore, it was not an irregularity to deny Mother’s motion without a hearing, and the trial court did not err in doing so.

Failure of the Court or Clerk’s Office

Finally, we turn to revision based on alleged failure of the court or clerk’s office to fulfill their duties. A failure of the court or clerk’s office sufficient to justify revision must be a failure to do something expressly required of them. CJP § 6-408; *see Gov. Employees Ins. Co. v. Ropka*, 74 Md. App. 249, 254–55 (1988) (“Failure to provide a copy of an order required to be sent by Rule 1-324 can be grounds for exercising the court’s revisory power.”); *see also Dir. of Finance of Baltimore City v. Harris*, 90 Md. App. 506, 513–14 (1992). In *Harris*, this Court held that it was a failure of the clerk to perform her duties under CJP section 6-408, and an irregularity under Rule 2-535, where a clerk refused to accept a party’s form for filing based on the clerk’s discretionary review of the form’s adequacy, when Maryland law requires clerks to record any paper filed with the clerk’s office. 90 Md. App. at 513–14.

Here, Mother contends that the court failed in the court’s duties by “failing to ensure that [Mother’s] marked exhibits were properly processed and maintained as a part of the record,” and failing “to amend custody and visitation of the minor children, despite both parties’ request for the court to do so[.]” First, Mother does not direct the court to what

exhibits or evidence she contends are missing from the record; hence, we do not have sufficient facts to hold that the trial court erred in not processing or including certain exhibits in the appellate record. Second, as to the court’s decision to maintain custody and visitation schedules, such decisions are at the discretion of the trial court. *See Santo v. Santo*, 448 Md. 620, 625 (2016) (citing *Petrini v. Petrini*, 336 Md. 453, 470 (1994)). Because Mother provided no facts demonstrating that the circuit court or the clerk’s office failed to undertake their duties as required by law, there was no failure of the court or clerk’s office meriting revision under CJP section 6-408.

Having no basis for revision based on fraud, mistake, irregularity, or failure of the court or clerk’s office, the trial court had no discretion that would allow the granting of the untimely Motion to Revise and did not err in denying the motion. *See* Md. Rule 2-535(a)–(b); CJP § 6-408.

ii. Lack of a Hearing on the Motion to Revise

Mother additionally contends that the trial court erred in denying the Motion to Revise without a hearing. As discussed *supra*, “[e]xcept when a rule expressly provides for a hearing,” or if the motion is filed under Rule 2-532, 2-533, or 2-534, if a hearing is requested “the court shall determine in each case whether a hearing will be held, but the court may not render a decision that is dispositive of a claim or defense without a hearing[.]” *See* Md. Rule 2-311(f).

Mother did request a hearing on the Motion to Revise; however, neither Rule 2-535 nor CJP section 6-408—the bases for the motion—provide for a hearing. *See* Md. Rule 2-535; CJP § 6-408. Likewise, motions to revise or vacate are not dispositive of a claim or

defense because the denial of such motions marks a “mere[] refus[al] to change [the court’s] original ruling” that was dispositive of the claim or defense. *Lowman*, 69 Md. App. at 75; *see also McDermott*, 185 Md. App. at 170 n.9. Hence, the trial court did not err in denying the Motion to Revise without a hearing.

iii. Denying the Motion to Revise Without Directly Addressing the Addendum Request

As a final note, we address Mother’s assertion that the court erred in ruling on the Motion to Revise without first expressly ruling on the addendum request for recusal. Mother’s addendum request for recusal was filed one month following the Motion to Revise, and hours prior to the court’s denial of the Motion to Revise. The docket identifies this filing as a “supplemental” petition,⁶ and the document itself is styled as an “[a]ddendum to [Mother’s] Motion to Revise[.]” Hence, the addendum request was part of the Motion to Revise and we conclude it was considered as such. Therefore, when the court summarily denied Mother’s Motion to Revise, after the addendum request was docketed, it denied the addendum request. *Cf. State v. Rovin*, 472 Md. 317, 338–39 (2021) (noting that, although not directly addressed, the circuit court resolved a pending motion to dismiss as it was subsumed in the decision and discussion rendered in the opinion filed).

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

⁶ In Maryland, the label on the docket is selected by the filing party at the time they electronically file the pleading.