

Circuit Court for Harford County  
Case No. C-12-FM-23-001613

UNREPORTED  
IN THE APPELLATE COURT  
OF MARYLAND

No. 2276

September Term, 2023

---

IN THE MATTER OF QUENNEL QUDRY  
QIAMAICHELO

---

Arthur,  
Friedman,  
Kenney, James A., III  
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

---

PER CURIAM

---

Filed: December 9, 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.

Quennel Qudry Qiamachelo, appellant, appeals from an order issued by the Circuit Court for Harford County denying his petition for an adult name change pursuant to Maryland Rule 15-901. For the reasons that follow, we shall affirm.

In 2023, appellant filed a petition to change his name to Quennel Qudry Quinnipiac Qlik. In that petition, he stated that the reason he was requesting his name to be changed was:

“A scam – Alibaba.com two cars-that did not have a dot sticker - \$ 87340 and \$10,000 American Express want me to pay. Plus, MVA will not title a motorcycle. I am in court for that. Mandamus – name fraudulently used.”

Because the stated reasons “raise[d] some concerns by the judge that reviewed it,” the court ordered a hearing on the petition. At the hearing, appellant alleged that he had purchased a vehicle on Alibaba.com that he did not receive. However, when he sought to dispute the charges with his credit card company, American Express, they refused to provide him a refund. As a result, he was involved in pending arbitration with American Express. Appellant also acknowledged having several other pending legal cases, including a case involving his vehicle being towed. In addition, appellant stated that with “AI” everything was “on the computer now,” including at his work, and it was “getting too complicated [ ] to deal with, and the only thing you can do for safety is just change your name.”

Based its “observations of [appellant’s] testimony . . . and the things that [he was] suggesting as to why [he wanted] to change [his] name” the court indicated that it believed the motivation for appellant to change his name did not “necessarily fit with what the statute or the rule expects.” Specifically, the court noted that the purpose of a name change

could not be “fraudulent, illegal, or to avoid some kind of legal obligation” and that appellant had made reference to debts and “trying to clear [himself] of those things.” The court did note that it would be willing to reconsider a subsequent petition from appellant when “there’s not a legal case pending and you don’t have this arbitration, where there’s a credit card debt that you’re seeking to address[.]”

On appeal, appellant asserts that the court erred in not granting his petition for a name change because he had purchased a vehicle on Alibaba that he never received, American Express refused to refund his money, he now has “collectors calling [him] day and night,” and he needs to have a name change to “fence off any scam that may arise in the months to come.” We disagree.

Among other things, Maryland Rule 15-901(c)(1)(E) & (F) provides that a name change petition must set forth “all reasons for the requested change” and a “certification that the petitioner is not requesting the name change for any illegal or fraudulent purpose[.]” This is consistent with Maryland common law which allows a person to “take and use any name he wants, so long as his purpose is not fraudulent and the use of the name does not interfere with the rights of others.” *Schroeder v. Broadfoot*, 142 Md. App. 569, 576 (2002).

Here appellant acknowledged that he was involved in a legal dispute with American Express regarding charges that he made on his credit card. And based on appellant’s testimony at the hearing, it was also reasonable for the court to find that appellant was seeking a name change, in part, to avoid having to pay for those charges, because he believed they were a “scam.” We take no position on the merits of appellant’s dispute with

American Express or his claim that he was defrauded by Alibaba. Nevertheless, resolution of those issues must be determined either by the arbitrator or an appropriate court. Appellant may not, however, seek to avoid possible legal liability for those charges by changing his name. Because the court could reasonably conclude that this was the purpose of appellant's name change petition, we shall affirm the judgment.

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