

UNREPORTED  
IN THE COURT OF SPECIAL APPEALS  
OF MARYLAND

No. 2185

September Term, 2016

---

CHARLES W. MAIN

v.

TERESA MAIN

---

Woodward, C.J.,  
Eyler, Deborah S.,  
Moylan, Charles E., Jr.  
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

---

PER CURIAM

---

Filed: February 8, 2018

\*This is an unreported opinion, and it may not be cited in any paper, brief, motion, or other document filed in this Court or any other Maryland Court as either precedent within the rule of stare decisis or as persuasive authority. Md. Rule 1-104.

Charles Main (“Charles” or appellant) and Teresa Main (“Teresa” or appellee) were married in Frederick County, Maryland, on September 22, 1973. The parties own real property located at 6441 Paul Rudy Road, Middletown, Maryland (“the marital property”) with an adjoining seventeen acres of land. The parties filed for separation in South Carolina, and on November 13, 2007, a South Carolina court entered an order of separation that, *inter alia*, ordered Charles to execute all documents necessary to transfer title of the marital property to Teresa and ordered the adjoining land sold with the proceeds divided between the parties. Teresa then moved to Duval County, Florida, where she filed a petition for dissolution of marriage. On December 21, 2010, the Florida court issued a final order of dissolution (“the Florida judgment”) that, *inter alia*, found that Charles had not complied with the South Carolina order to transfer title or sell the land. Accordingly, the Florida court ordered Charles to transfer title of the marital property to Teresa, and to cooperate in the sale of the adjoining land with the proceeds divided between the parties.

On July 25, 2012, Teresa filed in the Circuit Court for Frederick County a request to enroll the Florida judgment. Charles opposed the request, but following a hearing, the circuit court entered an order enrolling the judgment in Maryland, staying its execution for ninety days. This Court affirmed in an unreported opinion. *See Main v. Main*, No. 2372, Sept. Term 2013 (filed July 29, 2015) (hereinafter *Main I*). While the appeal was pending, Teresa filed a petition to enforce the circuit court judgment and to appoint a trustee to convey the marital property to her and to sell the adjoining property, which Charles opposed. Following a hearing on November 17, 2016, the court entered an order granting Teresa’s request and appointing a trustee. Charles noted this timely appeal.

On appeal, Charles questions the exercise of jurisdiction of the South Carolina and Florida courts over both him and the marital property. He maintains that the circuit court should not have applied the Full Faith and Credit Clause of the Constitution so as to enroll the Florida judgment in Maryland.<sup>1</sup> He also contends that the circuit court violated his Fourteenth Amendment right to due process, and that Teresa should have filed for divorce in Maryland.

Charles presented these same arguments to this Court in *Main I*, where he challenged the enrollment of the Florida judgment on the grounds that: 1) the South Carolina court did not have personal jurisdiction over him; 2) the Florida judgment was invalid because he was not served, and the Florida court had no jurisdiction over the marital property; 3) the circuit court failed to comply with Rule 8-212; and 4) the Full Faith and Credit Clause of the Constitution did not apply. *See Main I*, at slip op. 5. Accordingly, the law of the case doctrine bars re-litigation of these issues. *See Holloway v. State*, 232 Md. App. 272, 279 (2017) (“The law of the case doctrine provides that, ‘once an appellate court rules upon a question presented on appeal, litigants and lower courts become bound by the ruling, which is considered to be the law of the case.’” (quoting *Scott v. State*, 379 Md. 170, 183 (2004))). *See also Balt. Cnty. v. Fraternal Order of Police, Balt. Cnty. Lodge No. 4*, 449 Md. 713, 729 (2016) (“The law of the case doctrine is a ‘rule of practice, based upon sound policy that when an issue is once litigated and decided, that should be the end of the

---

<sup>1</sup> *See* U.S. CONST. art. IV, § 1.

matter.” (quoting *United States v. U.S. Smelting Refining & Mining Co.*, 339 U.S. 186, 198 (1950))). We, therefore, affirm.<sup>2</sup>

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

---

<sup>2</sup> In his brief, Charles does not specify how the circuit court violated his due process rights. Furthermore, he presents no argument or legal theory supporting his assertion that Teresa should have filed for divorce in Maryland. *See Petty v. Mayor & City Council of Balt. City*, 232 Md. App. 116, 121 (2017) (explaining that appellate court will not review an issue where appellant presents no legal theory supporting it). In her brief, Teresa states that she could not have filed for divorce in this State because she was then a resident of the State of Florida.