

Circuit Court for Montgomery County
Case No.: 170553FL

UNREPORTED
IN THE APPELLATE COURT
OF MARYLAND*

No. 170

September Term, 2024

RONALD JEAN-BAPTISTE

v.

MARIE MARTHE JEAN-BAPTISTE

Wells, C.J.,
Graeff,
Kehoe, Christopher B.
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned)
JJ.

PER CURIAM

Filed: December 26, 2024

* 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.

This is appellant, Ronald Jean-Baptiste (“Husband”)’s, second attempt to challenge two Qualified Domestic Relation Orders (“QRDOs”) entered in the Circuit Court for Montgomery County. In an appeal noted in October of 2023, Husband challenged an order calling for the entry of the QRDOs. *Jean-Baptiste v. Jean-Baptiste*, No. 1641, Sept. Term, 2023 (filed September 25, 2024) (“*Jean-Baptiste I*”).¹ This court affirmed after finding no merit to Husband’s claims. *Id.*

Meanwhile, after noting the appeal of *Jean-Baptiste I*, Husband continued to challenge the QRDOs in the circuit court. On November 27, 2023, the court entered the QRDOs. On December 1, 2023, Husband filed a motion for “Dismissal for Lack of Jurisdiction[,]” which asserted that the QRDOs are “not enforceable and illegal as they are not in compliance with the provisions under the Marital Separation Agreement (MSA).” On January 18, 2024, the court denied Husband’s motion.

On January 29, 2024, Husband filed a “Motion to Alter or Correct the 18JAN24 Court Judgment[,]” seeking for the court to “alter and amend” the QRDOs “to make [them] consistent ... with the MSA[.]” On February 27, 2024, the court denied Husband’s motion. On March 26, 2024, Husband noted the instant appeal.

On appeal, Husband asserts four “issues” for our review, three of which were previously asserted, verbatim, and resolved in *Jean-Baptiste I*. Accordingly, the law of the case doctrine prohibits Husband from re-litigating those issues in this appeal. *Hawes v.*

¹ Additional facts are set forth *Jean-Baptiste I*. We repeat only the facts necessary for determination of the matter presently before us.

Liberty Homes, Inc., 100 Md. App. 222, 231 (1994) (noting that the law of the case doctrine provides that “[d]ecisions rendered by a prior appellate panel will generally govern the second appeal[.]”).

The fourth “issue” asserted – the only new issue in this appeal – relates to correspondence sent by Beth Rogers, the attorney appointed to draft the QRDOs. Specifically, Husband points to two emails, dated March 7, 2024 and August 7, 2024, and one letter, dated April 2, 2024, which he asserts demonstrate that Ms. Rogers “acted outside the scope of her court appointment[.]” However, because Husband failed to raise this issue before the circuit court (indeed, the April letter and August email did not yet exist when he noted his appeal), it is not properly before us. *See* Md. Rule 8-131(a). Even assuming Husband had properly preserved this issue for our review, he fails to provide authority or argument in support of his position that the correspondence indicates any error or abuse of discretion on behalf of the circuit court.

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