

Circuit Court for Baltimore County
Case No.: 03-C-18-007407

UNREPORTED
IN THE APPELLATE COURT
OF MARYLAND

No. 383

September Term, 2024

JUAQUIN DAVIS

v.

CRYSTAL GOELLER

Beachley,
Albright,
Wright, Alexander, Jr.
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

PER CURIAM

Filed: February 7, 2025

*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.

In June 2023, the Circuit Court for Baltimore County issued an order modifying the custody and support obligations between Juaquin Davis, appellant, and Crystal Goeller, appellee. As part of that order, the court directed Davis to pay \$1,050 per month in child support. Davis appealed, and his case was docketed, in this Court, as No. 1044, September Term, 2023. That appeal was dismissed on February 7, 2024, for Davis’s failure to provide the necessary transcripts and failure to file a brief. The Mandate issued on April 2, and the Court denied Davis’s untimely motion for reconsideration on December 9.

Meanwhile, Davis failed to comply with his court-ordered support obligations, and so Goeller petitioned for contempt. Davis cross-petitioned for contempt, alleging that Goeller had failed to comply with provisions of the modification order related to the parties’ medical-appointment communication obligations. The court held a hearing on both petitions on April 5. The court found Davis to be in contempt and ordered that he may purge himself by paying \$1,500 directly to the Baltimore County Office of Child Support. The court declined to find Goeller in contempt. This appeal followed.

In his brief, Davis presents no argument about the court’s contempt finding. His arguments, instead, appear to fall into two categories: (1) arguments related to the court’s refusal to find Goeller in contempt; and (2) arguments related to issues he has with the June 2023 Modification Order. We decline to address either set of arguments.

Davis raises several evidentiary issues that allegedly occurred during the contempt hearing. Notably, however, he does not contend that the excluded evidence related to the court’s finding him in contempt. Rather, he argues that this evidence would have proven that Goeller was in contempt. But “where the circuit court has *not* adjudged [a] person or

entity in contempt of court, issues pertaining to a petition for contempt are not appealable[.]” *Trusted Science and Tech., Inc. v. Evancich*, 262 Md. App. 621, 655 (2024). In other words, Davis cannot seek appellate review of the portion of the circuit court’s order refusing to find Goeller in contempt. *See* Md. Code Ann., Cts. & Jud. Proc. Art. § 12-304(a); *Pack Shack, Inc. v. Howard Cnty.*, 371 Md. 243, 254 (2002). Thus, we decline to address these arguments.

Davis’s remaining arguments all relate to the merits of the June 2023 modification order. But that order is beyond the scope of our review in this appeal; this Court issued an Order on October 2, 2024, specifically informing Davis of this and reaffirmed the limitation in the December 9 Order. We therefore decline to address these arguments as well.

Davis mentions his contempt finding only in the last sentence of his brief where he “request[s] that the Order be vacated[and] wishes to have [his] conviction of Contempt in this proceeding also be vacated.” It is a party’s responsibility to present, in their principal brief, “[a]rgument in support of [their] position on each issue.” Md. Rule 8-405(a)(6). “We cannot be expected to delve through the record to unearth factual support favorable to [Davis] and then seek out law to sustain his position.” *Van Meter v. State*, 30 Md. App. 406, 408 (1976). Thus, because Davis has presented no argument that the circuit court’s contempt finding was erroneous, we shall affirm its judgment.

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