

Circuit Court for Baltimore City
Case No. 24-C-21-003191

UNREPORTED
IN THE APPELLATE COURT
OF MARYLAND

No. 643

September Term, 2023

RICHARD WILLIAMS

v.

INTERSTATE HOLDINGS, LLC

Friedman,
Zic,
Zarnoch, Robert A.
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

PER CURIAM

Filed: March 6, 2024

*This is a per curiam opinion. Consistent with Rule 1-104, the opinion is not precedent within the rule of stare decisis nor may it be cited as persuasive authority.

Richard Williams, appellant, appeals from an order issued by the Circuit Court for Baltimore City which foreclosed the right of redemption on his property following a tax sale. For the reasons that follow, we shall affirm the judgment of the circuit court.

In July 2020, Henry J. Raymond, Director of Finance and Collector of Taxes for the City of Baltimore, issued a “Certificate of Tax Sale,” in which he certified that Interstate Holdings, LLC, appellee, had purchased “at public auction, property in the City of Baltimore known as 0503 E 26TH ST.” The property, “having been assessed to” appellant, was sold for the sum of \$6,288, \$1,581.10 of which was “the total amount of taxes and other municipal liens due on the property at the time of the sale, together with interest and penalties thereon and expenses incurred in making the sale.” Mr. Raymond certified that the property was “subject to redemption” if the “balance due on account of the purchase price and all taxes and other municipal liens, together with interest and penalties on them accruing subsequent to the date of sale, [were] paid to the Collector[.]”

In July 2021, appellee filed a “Complaint to Foreclose Rights of Redemption” against appellant and other defendants. Appellant did not file an answer or any other responsive pleadings. In May 2023, the court entered a judgment foreclosing his right of redemption in the property. This appeal followed.

On appeal, appellant claims that: (1) other interested parties were not properly notified of the foreclosure action because the “Notice to Interested Parties of Action to Foreclose the Right of Redemption” was not posted on the correct property, and (2) that he paid all of the delinquent taxes and attorney fees prior to the court entering the final

judgment foreclosing the right of redemption.¹ However, these contentions are not properly before us as they raise factual issues, and rely on evidence never presented in the circuit court. *See* Maryland Rule 8-131(a) (“Ordinarily, an appellate court will not decide any [] issue unless it plainly appears by the record to have been raised in or decided by the trial court[.]”).² Consequently, we shall affirm the judgment.

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

¹ Appellant does not challenge service as to himself, and the record indicates that he was personally served with a copy of the complaint.

² Although we decline to address the merits of appellant’s claims, we note that this opinion is without prejudice to appellant raising them in an appropriate motion to vacate the judgment filed in the circuit court.