

Circuit Court for Prince George's County  
Case No. CAD08-22183

UNREPORTED  
IN THE COURT OF SPECIAL APPEALS  
OF MARYLAND

No. 2524

September Term, 2017

---

TIMOTHY A. REEVES

v.

MARIA MILLER

---

Woodward, C.J.,  
Graeff,  
Moylan, Charles E., Jr.  
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

---

PER CURIAM

---

Filed: November 21, 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.

Timothy Reeves, appellant, and Maria Miller, appellee, are the parents of M.R., a minor child. In 2008, Miller filed a complaint for custody in the Circuit Court for Prince George’s County. In 2009, the court awarded Miller primary physical custody of M.R., with the parties sharing joint legal custody. Reeves was also granted regular visitation and ordered to pay \$400.00 per month in child support. In 2013, the court modified the 2009 order by altering Reeves’s visitation schedule and increasing Reeves’s child support obligation to \$913.00 per month (October 2013 judgment).

On August 4, 2017, Reeves filed a motion entitled: “Affidavit; To Amend Revised; Amendment to Memorandum Points and Authorities In Support of Motion for Modification of Child Custody/Visitation; and Child Support; To Cease and Desist with Prejudice and Will/Shall Reimburse All Wage Garnishments of this Said Contract Order,” which the circuit court construed as a motion for modification of child custody, visitation, and child support (motion for modification). In that motion, Reeves contended that he was not a United States’ citizen and that the circuit court was a “fictional entity” that lacked subject matter jurisdiction and personal jurisdiction in the case. He also noted his “objection” to the October 2013 judgment, claiming that it was unlawful because, as “State Citizen of the republic,” he “retain[ed] [his] rights not to be compelled to perform under any contract or commercial agreement that [he] did not enter knowingly, voluntarily, and intentionally.” After the circuit court denied his motion, Reeves filed a notice of appeal, raising six issues that reduce to one: whether the circuit court erred in denying his motion for modification. Finding no error, we affirm.

To the extent Reeves’s motion for modification was, in fact, an attempt to modify the October 2013 judgment, it was properly denied because Reeves failed to allege that there had been a material change in circumstances. *See Jose v. Jose*, 237 Md. App. 588, 599 (2018) (noting that to obtain a change in custody or visitation a material change of circumstances must be proven); *Leineweber v. Leineweber*, 220 Md. App. 50, 60 (2014) (noting that the court may modify a child support order upon a showing of a material change in circumstances). On the other hand, to the extent Reeves was seeking to vacate the October 2013 judgment in its entirety, his challenge was wholly lacking in merit. As this Court noted in Reeves’s previous appeal, his contentions regarding “a supposed lack of jurisdiction of either the Circuit Court or Prince George’s County or the trial judge are groundless.” *Reeves v. Miller*, No. 1162, Sept. Term 2015 at 7 (filed March 15, 2016). Those claims, and the other claims raised in his motion for modification, are based on legal theories advanced by proponents of the “sovereign citizen” movement that “have not, will not, and cannot be accepted as valid.” *See Anderson v. O’Sullivan*, 224 Md. App. 501, 512–13 (2015).

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