

Circuit Court for Charles County
Case No.: C-08-CV-24-000562

UNREPORTED*

IN THE APPELLATE COURT

OF MARYLAND

No. 2254

September Term, 2024

BRIDGET EMORDI

v.

MARK O. SOBO

Reed,
Shaw,
Harrell, Glenn T., Jr.
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

PER CURIAM

Filed: December 3, 2025

*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.

Appellant Bridget Emordi sued her former attorney, appellee Mark O. Sobo, in the Circuit Court for Charles County, alleging legal malpractice. Sobo moved to dismiss for failure to state a claim, and, after a hearing, the circuit court granted his motion. This appeal followed.

We review the granting of a motion to dismiss to determine whether the circuit court’s decision was legally correct. *See Tavakoli-Nouri v. State*, 139 Md. App. 716, 725 (2001). In doing so, “we view the well-pleaded facts of the complaint in the light most favorable to the appellant[.]” *Id.* (cleaned up). To survive dismissal, the complaint must plead the material facts “with sufficient specificity. Bald assertions and conclusory statements by the pleader will not suffice.” *Adamson v. Corr. Med. Servs., Inc.*, 359 Md. 238, 246 (2000) (cleaned up). Thus, we will affirm a dismissal “if the complaint does not disclose, on its face, a legally sufficient cause of action.” *Rossaki v. NUS Corp.*, 116 Md. App. 11, 18 (1997) (cleaned up).

To adequately plead a claim of legal malpractice, a complaint must allege: “(1) the attorney’s employment; (2) [their] neglect of a reasonable duty; and (3) that such negligence resulted in and was the proximate cause of loss to the client.” *Bland v. Hammond*, 177 Md. App. 340, 350 (2007) (cleaned up).

Here, Emordi’s complaint and her subsequent more definite statement, *see* Md. Rule 2-322(d), alleged that she retained Sobo to represent her in two cases. The first case was against the wife of Emordi’s deceased business partner. According to Emordi, this case settled with an \$84,496 judgment in her favor. As best we can tell, Emordi’s only complaint about Sobo’s representation in this case is that she was not immediately able to collect on

the judgment. The second case sought removal of a lien on Emordi's home that had been placed in 2013. According to Emordi, she hired Sobo to appeal in that case, which he did not do. Neither Emordi's complaint nor her more definite statement specify a reasonable duty that Sobo neglected or explain how Sobo's alleged negligence proximately caused harm to Emordi. *See Bland*, 177 Md. App. at 350. The complaint therefore failed to state a claim for legal malpractice, and the circuit court did not err in dismissing it.

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