

UNREPORTED
IN THE APPELLATE COURT
OF MARYLAND

No. 2406

September Term, 2024

PETER J. WILLIAMS

v.

CARRIE M. WARD, *et al.*

Friedman,
Kehoe, S.,
Kenney, James A., III
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

PER CURIAM

Filed: May 14, 2026

Peter J. Williams, appellant, appeals from an order issued by the Circuit Court for Prince George’s County denying his motions to vacate a final judgment entered in his foreclosure case. On appeal he raises three issues, which reduce to one: whether the court erred in denying his motions to vacate. For the reasons that follow, we shall affirm.

In February 2023, appellees, the substitute trustees,¹ filed an Order to Docket seeking to foreclose on real property owned by appellant. The property was subsequently sold at a foreclosure sale, and the circuit court ratified the sale in August 2023. Despite being served with the Order to Docket, appellant did not file any pleadings in the foreclosure action.

On August 29, 2024, appellant filed a “Motion to Vacate Judgment for Fraudulent Deed of Trust.” That motion did not set forth any details about the alleged fraud. However, attached to the motion was an Identity Theft Report that appellant had filed with the Federal Trade Commission in November 2021, wherein he claimed that his mortgage loan was fraudulent because he was the victim of identity theft. The only details provided in that report were that he had relied on a law firm to help him and “did not understand the process of Real Estate and I lost Money [due] to FRAUD[.]” Thereafter, appellant filed several additional motions including a “Motion to Stop and Remove Permanent Sale”; a “Motion to Vacate Due to Fraud”; and a “Motion to Request Hearing.” Those motions did not contain any additional details and simply reiterated appellant’s previous request to vacate

¹ Appellees are Howard N. Bierman, Andrew J. Brenner, Nicholas Derdock, Jacob Geesing, Richard R. Goldsmith, Jr., Elizabeth C. Jones, Christopher Robert Selig, Philip Shriver, and Carrie M. Ward.

the ratification order.² On January 21, 2025, the court entered an order denying all of appellant’s motions to vacate. This appeal followed.

Appellant’s motions to vacate were filed approximately one year after the court entered its final judgment ratifying the foreclosure sale. Therefore, to the extent appellant was attempting to challenge that judgment, he could only do so pursuant to Maryland Rule 2-535(b). *Kent Island, LLC v. DiNapoli*, 430 Md. 348, 366 (2013) (noting that after 30 days have passed after the entry of a final judgment, a court may only modify its judgment upon a motion filed pursuant to Rule 2-535(b)). To vacate or modify an enrolled judgment pursuant to Rule 2-535(b), a movant must establish the existence of either fraud, mistake, or irregularity. But appellant’s non-specific claim of fraud does not demonstrate the existence of extrinsic fraud sufficient to vacate the judgment pursuant to Maryland Rule 2-535(b), as he was presumably aware of the issue in 2021 when he filed the report with the FTC, yet never raised it as a defense in the foreclosure action. *See generally Peay v. Barnett*, 236 Md. App. 306, 321 (2018) (“Maryland courts have narrowly defined and strictly applied the terms fraud, mistake, [and] irregularity, in order to ensure finality of judgments.” (quotation marks and citation omitted)). Thus, the court did not err in denying appellant’s motions to vacate.

² In January 2025, appellant also filed exhibits with the court, including a 2024 MLS listing of the property from the foreclosure purchaser and a letter from the VA stating that he was 100% disabled. It is not clear how these exhibits were relevant to anything he raised in his motion to vacate, and appellant does not mention them on appeal.

Appellant nevertheless asserts that the judgment should be vacated because the loan “had been paid off and closed years earlier[,]” resulting in a “fraudulent and void” judgment. He also contends that his due process rights were violated when he was “evicted without a valid debt or proper verification of ownership.” These claims, however, are not preserved as they were not raised in his motions to vacate. Consequently, we will not consider them for the first time on appeal. *See Klauenberg v. State*, 355 Md. 528, 552 (1999) (“[A]rguments not presented in a brief or not presented with particularity will not be considered on appeal.”).

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