

Circuit Court for Anne Arundel County
Case No.: C-02-CR-22-001623

UNREPORTED
IN THE APPELLATE COURT
OF MARYLAND

No. 1144

September Term, 2024

SHAUNESI Y. DEBERRY

v.

STATE OF MARYLAND

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

JJ.

PER CURIAM

Filed: November 4, 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.

A jury in the Circuit Court for Anne Arundel County convicted Shaunesi Y. DeBerry, appellant, of second-degree assault. The court later sentenced her to three years’ incarceration, all but time served suspended, followed by three years’ probation. This Court then affirmed the conviction and sentence on direct appeal. *DeBerry v. State*, Nos. 114, 774, & 1526, Sept. Term, 2023 (filed April 4, 2024) (*per curiam*).

DeBerry has since filed dozens of motions in this criminal case, which have been followed by dozens of noted appeals to this Court. This appeal covers one notice of appeal filed on August 8, 2024, from the denial of a “Motion for Injunctive Relief, or in the Alternative, Summary Judgment.”

On appeal, DeBerry presents no coherent argument about the denial of this motion. That alone is reason enough to affirm the circuit court’s judgment. *See Van Meter v. State*, 30 Md. App. 406, 408 (1976) (“Surely it is not incumbent upon this Court, merely because a point is mentioned as being objectionable at some point in a party’s brief, to scan the entire record and ascertain if there be any ground, or grounds, to sustain the objectionable feature suggested.” (cleaned up)); *see also* Md. Rule 8-504(a)(6).

In any event, even if this order is appealable, the circuit court did not abuse its discretion. DeBerry’s motion cited to Maryland Rule 15-502 and requested—as best we can tell—that the court order the Division of Probation and Parole to provide her a “wet signature certified copy of [her] Probation Order[.]” Put simply, DeBerry was not entitled

to the relief she requested, and so the court did not abuse its “broad discretionary authority” in denying her motion. *Schisler v. State*, 394 Md. 519, 534 (2006) (cleaned up).

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