

Circuit Court for Carroll County
Case No.: 06-C-17-074087

UNREPORTED
IN THE APPELLATE COURT
OF MARYLAND

No. 1611

September Term, 2023

CHARLES WILLIAM CRUMP

v.

TIFFANY OLIVIA CRUMP

Beachley,
Albright,
Woodward, Patrick L.
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

PER CURIAM

Filed: October 10, 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.

Charles William Crump, appellant, noted this appeal on October 16, 2023, in his custody case proceeding in the Circuit Court for Carroll County. The record reveals that the circuit court did not enter any orders in the 30 days preceding the filing of his notice of appeal. In his brief, Crump does not allege the court made any error. He first seems to take issue with the fact that a recusal motion he filed was docketed in this case as well as two protective-order cases. We note that the motion contains the circuit court case numbers for all three of those cases in its caption. And in any event, the record shows that Crump voluntarily withdrew the recusal motion—at least as far as it applied to the custody case—at a hearing on September 15, 2023. Crump’s brief also discusses his “[f]inancial [i]ssues . . . resulting in self-representation and lack of support resources for appeal.” But again, he does not allege any error by the circuit court, which is the only thing for which this Court reviews. *See DeLuca v. State*, 78 Md. App. 395, 397–98 (1989); *see also Van Meter v. State*, 30 Md. App. 406, 408 (1976) (“We cannot be expected to delve through the record to unearth factual support favorable to appellant and then seek out law to sustain his position.”). Because there were no appealable judgments or orders entered in the 30 days preceding Crump’s notice, we shall dismiss this appeal as untimely. Md. Rule 8-602(b)(2).

APPEAL DISMISSED. COSTS TO BE PAID BY APPELLANT.