

Circuit Court for Prince George's County
Case No. CAD15-2057

UNREPORTED
IN THE COURT OF SPECIAL APPEALS
OF MARYLAND

No. 3311

September Term, 2018

ANGELA SPEIGHT

v.

LEE CARLTON WILLIAMS, JR.

Nazarian,
Leahy,
Raker, Irma S.
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

PER CURIAM

Filed: November 4, 2019

*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.

Angela Speight, appellant, and Lee Williams, Jr., appellee, are the parents of H.W., a minor child. On February 1, 2016, the Circuit Court for Prince George’s County entered a consent custody order granting the parties joint legal custody; awarding Ms. Speight primary physical custody; and allowing Mr. Williams visitation. The parties subsequently filed cross-motions to modify the custody order. Following a May 15, 2018 hearing, the court found that Ms. Speight had abused the protective order system to prevent Mr. Williams from having visitation with H.W. and ordered that *pendente lite* physical custody of H.W. be awarded to Mr. Williams. The court subsequently entered a final order on August 21, 2018, awarding Mr. Williams sole legal and physical custody of H.W. and allowing Ms. Speight to have nightly telephone contact with H.W. through “Facetime” or Skype. Ms. Speight did not appeal that order.

Thereafter, Ms. Speight filed a motion for modification of custody and contempt, claiming that she should have sole physical and legal custody of H.W. because Mr. Williams had not consistently facilitated her telephone contact with H.W; Mr. Williams had lied about having medical insurance for H.W.; she believed H.W.’s “hair and hygiene were not decent”; and she had observed Mr. William’s mother become “irate with [H.W.]” On February 8, 2019, the court held a hearing on Ms. Speight’s motion. After hearing testimony from Ms. Speight, the court found that Mr. Williams had not willfully violated the August 2018 custody order and that Ms. Speight had not demonstrated a material change in circumstances warranting a modification in custody. This appeal followed.

Ms. Speight’s sole contention on appeal is that the court erred in awarding sole physical and legal custody of H.W. to Mr. Williams. However, she did not file a notice of

appeal from the May 21, 2018 *pendente lite* custody order or the August 21, 2018 final custody order. Consequently, this issue is not properly before us on appeal. See Maryland Rule 8-202(a)(providing that a notice of appeal must be filed “within 30 days after entry of the judgment order from which the appeal is taken”).

Ms. Speight does not raise any specific claims of error with respect to the February 8, 2019 order denying her motion for modification of custody and contempt, the only judgment that is properly before us. See *Diallo v. State*, 413 Md. 678, 692-93 (2010) (noting that arguments that are “not presented with particularity will not be considered on appeal” (citation omitted)). And, based on our review of the record, we perceive no error in the court’s decision to deny her motion for modification of custody and contempt. Consequently, we shall affirm the judgment of the circuit court.

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