Circuit Court for Baltimore County Case No. 03-C-15-008544 Argued: October 31, 2019

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND

No. 27

September Term, 2019

BETTYE JEAN MCFARLAND

v.

BALTIMORE COMMUNITY LENDING, INC.

Barbera, C.J., McDonald Watts Hotten Booth Harrell, Glenn T., Jr. (Senior Judge, Specially Assigned) Greene, Clayton, Jr. (Senior Judge, Specially Assigned) JJ.

> PER CURIAM ORDER McDonald, J., concurs.

Pursuant to Maryland Uniform Electronic Legal Materials Act (§§ 10-1601 et seq. of the State Government Article) this document is authentic.



Suzanne C. Johnson, Clerk

Filed: February 28, 2020

BETTYE JEAN MCFARLAND * IN THE * COURT OF APPEALS * OF MARYLAND * COA-REG-0027-2019 * No. 27 BALTIMORE COMMUNITY LENDING, INC. * September Term, 2019

PER CURIAM ORDER

The petition for writ of certiorari in the above-entitled case having been granted and argued, it is this <u>28th</u> day of <u>February</u>, 2020,

ORDERED, by the Court of Appeals of Maryland, that the writ of certiorari be, and it is hereby, dismissed with costs, the petition having been improvidently granted.

/s/ Mary Ellen Barbera Chief Judge Circuit Court for Baltimore County Case No. 03-C-15-008544 Argued: October 31, 2019

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND

No. 27

SEPTEMBER TERM, 2019

BETTYE JEAN MCFARLAND

v.

BALTIMORE COMMUNITY LENDING, INC.

Barbera, C.J., McDonald Watts Hotten Booth Harrell, Glenn T., Jr. (Senior Judge, Specially Assigned) Greene, Clayton, Jr. (Senior Judge, Specially Assigned) JJ.

Concurring Opinion by McDonald, J.

Filed: February 28, 2020

I agree with the Court's decision to dismiss the petition in this case as improvidently granted. *See Sturdivant v. Md. Dep't of Health & Mental Hygiene*, 436 Md. 584, 589 (2014). I write simply to point out that neither this Court nor the Court of Special Appeals has yet to determine, in the context of a joint bank account, whether to adopt a "full ownership" or "equal shares" presumption concerning ownership of the funds in such an account. *See Morgan Stanley & Co. v. Andrews*, 225 Md. App. 181, 192 n.9 (2015) ("[W]e need not determine precisely which type of presumption of ownership is appropriate under Maryland law."). Perhaps a different case will present an opportunity for this Court to provide clarity on this important question.