Circuit Court for Prince George's County
Case No.: C-16-CV-23-004097

IN THE APPELLATE COURT

OF MARYLAND*

No. 198

September Term, 2024

_____

TIFFANY MADERA MONROE

v.

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY
GOVERNMENT

_____

Nazarian,
Reed,
Harrell, Glenn T., Jr.
        (Senior Judge, Specially Assigned)
JJ.

_____

PER CURIAM

_____

Filed: November 13, 2024

In June of 2020, appellant, Tiffany Madera Monroe ("Ms. Monroe"), filed a complaint against Prince George's County, appellee, asserting negligence, among other claims, relating to an involuntary admission for an emergency psychiatric evaluation on December 18, 2017. After a hearing in August of 2021, her complaint was dismissed and on appeal, this Court affirmed. *See Monroe v. Prince George's County*, Maryland, No. 1082, Sept. Term, 2021 (filed May 24, 2022) ("*Monroe I*").

On September 6, 2023, Ms. Monroe filed a new complaint against Prince George's County. Although difficult to discern, the allegations in her complaint center around the involuntary hospital admission in 2017 and the proceedings in *Monroe I*. It asserts that appellees are liable for negligence, personal injury, and fraud, among others, and requests one billion dollars in damages. After a hearing, the Circuit Court for Prince George's County granted appellee's motion to dismiss, noting that Ms. Monroe had failed to state a claim upon which relief could be granted; that the doctrine of *res judicata* precluded her claims; and additionally, that her claims were barred by the statute of limitations. Ms. Monroe noted the instant appeal.

On appeal, Ms. Monroe maintains that *res judicata* does not apply to her claims because she "was not present during the Zoom hearing" in *Monroe I* and because her claims in this case include a new challenge to the truthfulness of an affidavit submitted by counsel for appellee in *Monroe I*. But *res judicata* applies not only to claims actually asserted in a previous preceding, but to "claims that could have been asserted and litigated in the original suit." *Richman v. FWB Bank*, 122 Md. App. 110, 148 (1998), *aff'd*, 354 Md. 472 (1999). Here, a review of Ms. Monroe's complaint indicates that it seeks to re-litigate matters

relating to the 2017 hospital admission or the judgment entered between the parties in *Monroe I*. Accordingly, each of her claims are matters that either were asserted or could have been asserted in *Monroe I* and are thus barred by *res judicata*. *Mackall v. Zayre Corp.*, 293 Md. 221, 228 (1982) ("[I]f a proceeding between parties involves the same cause of action as a previous proceeding between the same parties, the principle of res judicata applies and all matters actually litigated or that could have been litigated are conclusive in the subsequent proceeding.").

Even assuming, *arguendo*, that Ms. Monroe's claims were not barred by *res judicata*, her complaint fails to state a cause of action for which relief could be granted. To survive a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim, "well-pleaded facts setting forth the cause of action must be pleaded with sufficient specificity; bald assertions and conclusory statements by the pleader will not suffice." *RRC Ne., LLC v. BAA Maryland, Inc.*, 413 Md. 638, 643-44 (2010). Here, Ms. Monroe's thirty-seven-page complaint includes various claims against appellee, including that appellee is liable for negligence, personal injury, and fraud, among others, but fails to include facts necessary to support such allegations. Instead, it includes conclusory statements and recites several statutes and rules without any explanation of their applicability to her claims. Accordingly, even if Ms. Monroe's claims were not barred by *res judicata*, her complaint fails to set forth facts setting forth any cause of action with sufficient specificity, and dismissal was proper.

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