

APPENDIX

Appendix A

Order of the Supreme Court of Maryland Denying the Motion for Reconsideration in
Case No. SCM-PET-0498-2025 (Dated [May 26, 2026])

*
IN THE
*
SUPREME COURT
PETITIONS FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI *
OF MARYLAND
*
September Term, 2025.¹
*

O R D E R

It is this 26th day of May 2026, by the Supreme Court of Maryland,

ORDERED that the following petitions for writ of certiorari are denied:

- Pet. No. 461 – Clovis Akobong v. Valerine Achu
- Pet. No. 466 – Deborah Fried v. State of Maryland
- Pet. No. 468 – Nelda Fink v. Pevco Systems International, Inc., et al.
- Pet. No. 474 – John Swann v. Stacye Hill
- Pet. No. 482 – Michael Robb v. State of Maryland
- Pet. No. 487 – Sanita Rubanova v. Taylor Welsh
- Pet. No. 488 – Razak Ibrahim v. State of Maryland
- Pet. No. 494 – Edwin Grimes v. Barbara Phelps
- Pet. No. 500 – Arlin Pierce Duley v. State of Maryland
- Pet. No. 506 – John Poteat v. Maryland Transit Authority
- Pet. No. 2* – Julie A. Gaskins v. EasyKnock, Inc. d/b/a EK Realty, et al.
- Pet. No. 3* – Jennifer Remmes v. State of Maryland
- Pet. No. 4* – Ashley Griffith v. Timothy Donaldson
- Pet. No. 6* – Kayla Marie Yates v. Marcus Jawone Ganey

¹ All petitions and motions were filed in September Term 2025 unless otherwise indicated. Petitions and motions indicated with * were filed in September Term 2026.

Pet. No. 7* – Antonio Pierre Barnett v. State of Maryland

Pet. No. 8* – Fitzgerald Donald Reid v. State of Maryland

Pet. No. 9* – Heru Muhammad El v. Tamiesha Chase
Motion for Leave to File Petition for Writ of Certiorari Out of Time granted.

Pet. No. 12* – Michael Boyd v. State of Maryland

Pet. No. 14* – Marx Carlton Jackson v. State of Maryland

Pet. No. 15* – Nicole Peters-Humes v. Lafayette Federal Credit Union

Pet. No. 17* – William Bailey, Sr. v. Jamia Happer

Pet. No. 18* – In the Matter of Yunguo Gong

Pet. No. 19* – James Davis, Jr. v. State of Maryland

Pet. No. 20* – L. N. v. University of Maryland Medical System Corporation, et al.
Justice Booth did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Pet. No. 22* – Linda C. Bolton, et al. v. Crowley, Hodge & Fein PC

Pet. No. 23* – Robert Evans v. State of Maryland

Pet. No. 24* – Gloria Merritt v. Don Marlow

Pet. No. 25* – Thomas Dwayne Cook v. State of Maryland

Pet. No. 26* – Brian C. Rosenberg, et al. v. William Hoffer, et al.
Motion to strike and for sanctions denied.

Pet. No. 27* – Lauren Dean v. Clayton Dean

Pet. No. 31* – Darius Sheppard v. State of Maryland

Pet. No. 32* – In Re: Estate of Richard W. Moore, Sr., et al.
“Motion to Transfer this Case to the 4th Circuit in Richmond” denied.
Justice Biran did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Pet. No. 33* – In the Matter of Erin Bowling

Pet. No. 34* – Samuel Z. Alemayehu v. Bank of America, N.A.

Pet. No. 36* – Kenneth R. Cunningham v. State of Maryland

Pet. No. 38* – Clifton D. Shields, Jr. v. State of Maryland

Pet. No. 45* – Marlo Cruz v. State of Maryland

Pet. No. 47* – Terry Carter v. Rendell Hanks

Pet. No. 48* – Terry Carter v. Alexis Y. Hanks

Pet. No. 91* – Kent Bell v. State of Maryland

And it is further

ORDERED that the following petitions for writ of certiorari are dismissed:

Pet. No. 73* – Philomena Odum v. Montgomery County, Maryland

Pursuant to § 12-305 of the Courts and Judicial Proceedings Article, the petition for writ of certiorari is dismissed for lack of jurisdiction and the motion to consolidate cases is denied as moot.

Pet. No. 74* – Philomena Odum v. Montgomery County, Maryland

Pursuant to § 12-305 of the Courts and Judicial Proceedings Article, the petition for writ of certiorari is dismissed for lack of jurisdiction and the motion to consolidate cases is denied as moot.

Pet. No. 75* – Philomena Odum v. Montgomery County, Maryland

Pursuant to § 12-305 of the Courts and Judicial Proceedings Article, the petition for writ of certiorari is dismissed for lack of jurisdiction and the motion to consolidate cases is denied as moot.

Pet. No. 76* – Philomena Odum v. Montgomery County, Maryland

Pursuant to § 12-305 of the Courts and Judicial Proceedings Article, the petition for writ of certiorari is dismissed for lack of jurisdiction and the motion to consolidate cases is denied as moot.

Pet. No. 77* – Philomena Odum v. Montgomery County, Maryland

Pursuant to § 12-305 of the Courts and Judicial Proceedings Article, the petition for writ of certiorari is dismissed for lack of jurisdiction and the motion to consolidate cases is denied as moot.

Pet. No. 78* – Philomena Odum v. Montgomery County, Maryland

Pursuant to § 12-305 of the Courts and Judicial Proceedings Article, the petition for writ of certiorari is dismissed for lack of jurisdiction and the motion to consolidate cases is denied as moot.

And it is further

ORDERED that the motions for reconsideration filed in the following matters are denied.

Pet. No. 431 – Rabitah Moses v. Alex Vasquez

Justice Killough did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Pet. No. 436 – Karin Marie Kendrick v. James E. Clarke, et al.

Pet. No. 498 – Anthony Quinn Wheeler, Jr. v. Giant of Maryland, LLC
*“Petitioner's Motion for Leave to File Supplement to Pending Petition for
Writ of Certiorari” denied as moot.*



/s/ Matthew J. Fader
Chief Justice

Pursuant to the Maryland Uniform Electronic Legal
Materials Act (§§ 10-1601 et seq. of the State
Government Article) this document is authentic.



2026.05.26
12:56:01 -04'00'

Gregory Hilton, Clerk



Supreme Court of Maryland

Robert C. Murphy Courts of Appeal Building
361 Rowe Boulevard
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Gregory Hilton,
Clerk

(410) 260-1500
(800) 926-2583

May 26, 2026

NOTICE OF ORDER

Anthony Quinn Wheeler, Jr. v. Giant of Maryland, LLC
Petition No. 498, September Term, 2025

On May 26, 2026, the Court entered an order¹ denying the motion in this Court.

/s/ Gregory Hilton
Clerk

Copy to: All counsel of record
Any unrepresented parties
Clerk, Appellate Court of Maryland
Clerk, Circuit Court

¹ The Court's order can be viewed online at <https://www.mdcourts.gov/scm/petitions>.

Appendix B

Order of the Supreme Court of Maryland Denying the Petition for Writ of Certiorari
in Case No. SCM-PET-0498-2025 (Dated [**April 27, 2026**])

PETITIONS FOR WRIT OF
CERTIORARI

*
IN THE
*
SUPREME COURT
*
OF MARYLAND
*
September Term, 2025.¹
*

ORDER

It is this 27th day of April 2026, by the Supreme Court of Maryland,

ORDERED that the following petitions for writ of certiorari are denied:

Pet. No. 446 – Gary Watkins v. State of Maryland

Pet. No. 451 – Alonzo Turner v. Challon Torres-Durphy

Pet. No. 453 – Kevin A. Soper v. State of Maryland

Emergency Request for Stay of Lower Court Proceedings is denied.

Pet. No. 454 – Harley Leroy Crawford v. Zahara Yassin Seid

Pet. No. 462 – Rabitah Moses v. Tiffany Kelly

Justice Killough did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Pet. No. 463 – Heather M. Robles v. Navy Federal Credit Union

Pet. No. 469 – Roxanne Hawkins v. Kunal Ajmera, et al.

Motion to Strike Respondents' Answer is denied.

Pet. No. 470 – John Destin Alexander v. Norvel Brinkley

Pet. No. 471 – HSN, LLC v. Mayor and City Council of Baltimore

Pet. No. 472 – In the Matter of Falls Road Comm. Ass'n, et al.

Pet. No. 473 – Evert R. Hawk, II v. Angela Wallace

Pet. No. 476 – Marcus Moses v. Tasha Moses

¹ All petitions and motions were filed in September Term 2025 unless otherwise indicated.
Petitions and motions indicated with * were filed in September Term 2026.

Pet. No. 477 – Dominion Properties LLC, et al. v. Midaro Investments 2021, LLC

Pet. No. 478 – Aaron Bruce Garrett v. State of Maryland

Pet. No. 479 – Ashlee Nicole Scott v. State of Maryland

Pet. No. 483 – Antionette Williams v. LOGS Legal Group, LLP

Pet. No. 484 – Reaj Hossain, et al. v. Tung Po Chiu

Pet. No. 486 – Brian C. Douglas v. Highbridge Community Association, Inc.

Pet. No. 489 – John B. Classen v. Michael Eney, et al.

Pet. No. 490 – In the Matter of Justin Holder

Pet. No. 491 – Oladayo Ade Oladokun v. State of Maryland

Pet. No. 492 – Kaitlyn Gautereaux v. Matthew R. Gelber

Pet. No. 493 – Brian Campbell v. State of Maryland

Pet. No. 496 – Warren Gray v. State of Maryland

Pet. No. 497 – Gary Shaw v. Litz Custom Homes

Motion to Dismiss/Strike Informal Petition for Writ of Certiorari is denied as moot.

Pet. No. 498 – Anthony Quinn Wheeler, Jr. v. Giant of Maryland, LLC

Pet. No. 499 – Christine Smith v. Bozzuto Management Company

Pet. No. 501 – Linda Kay Twigg v. Maryland Department of Labor

Pet. No. 503 – Kiasha Samuels v. Tyrelle Dunn, Sr.

“Emergency Application for an Injunction Supreme Court Rule 22” is denied.

Pet. No. 504 – Odunayo Ajayi v. Olaide Ogunsade

Pet. No. 505 – In the Matter of Lubna Khan

Pet. No. 507 – Jose W. Orellana-Cedillos v. State of Maryland

Pet. No. 1* – Robert Hainey, et al. v. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan of the Mid-Atlantic States, Inc., et al.

And it is further

ORDERED that the following petition for writ of certiorari is dismissed:

Pet. No. 508 – Mason Inko-Tariah v. Vamsi Kanumuri, et al.

Pursuant to Md. Rule 8-602(b)(1), the petition is dismissed as not allowed by law.

And it is further

ORDERED that the motions for reconsideration filed in the following matters are denied.

Pet. No. 400 – Jennifer S. Horne v. Robert M. Horne

Pet. No. 401 – Jennifer S. Horne v. Robert M. Horne



/s/ Matthew J. Fader
Chief Justice



Supreme Court of Maryland

Robert C. Murphy Courts of Appeal Building
361 Rowe Boulevard
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Gregory Hilton,
Clerk

(410) 260-1500
(800) 926-2583

April 27, 2026

NOTICE OF ORDER

Anthony Quinn Wheeler, Jr. v. Giant of Maryland, LLC
Petition No. 498, September Term, 2025

On April 27, 2026, the Court entered an order¹ denying the petition in this Court.

/s/ Gregory Hilton
Clerk

Copy to: All counsel of record
Any unrepresented parties
Clerk, Appellate Court of Maryland
Clerk, Circuit Court

¹ The Court's order can be viewed online at <https://www.mdcourts.gov/scm/petitions>.

Appendix C

Order of the Appellate Court of Maryland Denying the Motion for Reconsideration
in Case No. ACM-REG-2131-2024 (Dated [**February 06, 2026**])

ANTHONY QUINN WHEELER, JR.,
Appellant,
v.
GIANT OF MARYLAND, LLC,
Appellee.

* IN THE
* APPELLATE COURT
* OF MARYLAND
* No. 2131 September Term, 2024
* MDEC: ACM-REG-2131-2024
* (Cir. Ct. No. C-03-CV-23-001953)
* * * * *

ORDER

Upon consideration of the appellant's "Motion to Recall Mandate and for Reconsideration Pursuant to Md. Code, Cts. & Jud. Proc. § 6-408 and Md. Rule 8-605, Request for Clarified Statement of Decision Pursuant to Md. Rule 8-605(f), and Request for Discretionary Remand Pursuant to Md. Rule 8-604(d)," it is, this _ 6th _ day of February 2026, by the Appellate Court of Maryland,

ORDERED, on the Court's own initiative, that the filing fee associated with the motion required to be paid to this Court is waived; and it is further

ORDERED that the motion is denied; and it is further

ORDERED that, pursuant to Maryland Rule 8-606(b)(4)(B), the Clerk shall issue the mandate immediately following the entry of this Order.



FOR A PANEL OF THE COURT
(consisting of Wells, C.J., Graeff, Kenney, James A., III
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned), JJ.)

Judge's Signature Appears
on Original Order
Gregory Wells, Chief Judge

Appendix D

Unreported Written Opinion of the Appellate Court of Maryland in Case No.

ACM-REG-2131-2024 (Dated [**January 02, 2026**])

Circuit Court for Baltimore County
Case No.: C-03-CV-23-001953

UNREPORTED*

IN THE APPELLATE COURT

OF MARYLAND

No. 2131

September Term, 2024

ANTHONY QUINN WHEELER, JR.

v.

GIANT OF MARYLAND, LLC

Wells, C.J.,
Graeff,
Kenney, James A., III
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

PER CURIAM

Filed: January 2, 2026

*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.

App. 6a

Appellant Anthony Quinn Wheeler, Jr., sued his former employer, appellee Giant of Maryland, LLC, in the Circuit Court for Baltimore County, alleging racial discrimination, wrongful discharge, and defamation. Giant removed the case to the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, which ultimately dismissed Wheeler's federal claims but declined to rule on his state law claims, instead remanding them to the circuit court.

After the case was remanded, Wheeler filed an amended complaint alleging the same causes of action—including his previously dismissed federal claims—and Giant moved to dismiss for failure to state a claim for relief. After a hearing, the circuit court granted the motion and dismissed the case. This appeal followed.

Wheeler first seems to seek review of the federal court's dismissal of his federal claims. We lack jurisdiction to do so. *See* Md. Code Ann., Cts. & Jud. Proc. § 12-301 (Unless otherwise authorized by law, "a party may appeal [to this Court] from a final judgment entered in a civil or criminal case by a circuit court."). *See also* 28 U.S.C.A. § 1291 ("The [federal] courts of appeals . . . shall have jurisdiction of appeals from all final decisions of the district courts of the United States[.]"). To the extent that Wheeler contends the circuit court should have considered the merits of his previously dismissed federal claims, even if preserved, we disagree. Here, the District Court dismissed Wheeler's federal claims against Giant with prejudice, and he did not appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. As a result, any attempt to bring the same claims against Giant is barred by principles of *res judicata*, and the circuit court could not have considered

them. See *Anne Arundel Cnty. Bd. of Educ. v. Norville*, 390 Md. 93, 103 (2005); *Lizzi v. Washington Metro. Area Transit Auth.*, 384 Md. 199, 211–12 (2004).

As for Wheeler’s claims of wrongful discharge and defamation, we review the granting of a motion to dismiss to determine whether the circuit court’s decision was legally correct. See *Tavakoli-Nouri v. State*, 139 Md. App. 716, 725 (2001). In doing so, “we view the well-pleaded facts of the complaint in the light most favorable to the appellant[.]” *Id.* (cleaned up). To survive dismissal, the complaint must plead the material facts “with sufficient specificity. Bald assertions and conclusory statements by the pleader will not suffice.” *Adamson v. Corr. Med. Servs., Inc.*, 359 Md. 238, 246 (2000) (cleaned up). Thus, we will affirm a dismissal “if the complaint does not disclose, on its face, a legally sufficient cause of action.” *Rossaki v. NUS Corp.*, 116 Md. App. 11, 18 (1997) (cleaned up).

To adequately plead a claim of wrongful discharge, a complaint must allege: (1) that the employee was discharged; (2) that the discharge “violat[ed] some clear mandate of public policy”; and (3) that there is a “nexus between the employee’s conduct and the employer’s decision to fire the employee.” *Wholey v. Sears Roebuck*, 370 Md. 38, 50–51 (2002). To plead the second element, the employee must identify “the policy in question with clarity, specificity, and authority.” *Bagwell v. Peninsula Reg’l Med. Ctr.*, 106 Md. App. 470, 495 (1995).

The operative complaint here failed to identify any clear mandate of public policy or plead facts sufficient to show that Giant violated such policy. As best we can tell, Wheeler generally claimed that he “refused to violate[] the law in a protected class,” but

the complaint does not allege that he was fired for refusing to violate any specific law or for exercising a particular legal right or duty. To be sure, liberally construed, the complaint alleges that Wheeler was fired because of his race. But that is not a basis for a claim of wrongful discharge because Maryland and federal anti-discrimination laws already provide a remedy. *See Makovi v. Sherwin-Williams Co.*, 316 Md. 603, 609 (1989). Thus, the complaint failed to state a claim of wrongful discharge.

To adequately plead a claim for defamation, the complaint must allege: (1) the defendant made a defamatory statement to a third person; (2) the statement was false; (3) the defendant was at fault in making the statement; and (4) the plaintiff suffered harm. *See Piscatelli v. Van Smith*, 424 Md. 294, 306 (2012). Here, the complaint generally alleges that Wheeler's former manager made false statements to the police about Wheeler after an altercation at work. It does not identify any specific statement that was false or how it defamed him. What's more, the complaint does not allege any facts showing that Wheeler was harmed by his former manager's statement to the police; it does not claim he was detained, arrested, or charged with any crime. Consequently, the complaint failed to state a claim of defamation, and the circuit court did not err in dismissing it.¹

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

¹ On appeal, Wheeler also contends the circuit court erred in denying his motions alleging spoliation of evidence. Given our holding here, we need not address this issue.

Appendix E

Order of the Circuit Court for Baltimore County Denying the Motion for

Reconsideration in Case No. C-03-CV-23-001953 (Dated [**December 11, 2024**])

Baltimore County Courts Building
401 Bosley Avenue
Towson, Maryland 21204

November 20, 2024

Plaintiff: Anthony Quinn Wheeler Jr. Pro-Se

Case Number # C-03-CV-23-001953

V.

Defendant: Giant Of Maryland LLC

MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF DENIAL OF MOTION FOR SANCTIONS

This document supports the Plaintiff Motion for Sanctions and Monetary Relief, due to the Defendant's failure to comply with discovery requests in accordance with Maryland Rule 2-431 and 2-432, in which the defendant committed spoliation of evidences by concealing, and refused to cooperate.

I. "Background"

I the Plaintiff had filed a Amended PLAINTIFF MULTIPLE MOTION BRIEF, on data 10/29/2024, which within the brief are toward Motion for Sanction, adverse inferences towards spoliation in concealing evidence, and towards monetary sanction.

The defendant done deficiency filing in the responds of opposition for sanction, on data 11/08/2024, which their brief is not accepted, and had 7 days left to request of extension of time under Md Rule 1-204, to correct the error, in which did not request for time, as the expiration data is on 11/15/2024.

Failure to Comply

The Court gave the defendant a Order under Md Rule 20-201 to fix their deficiency error within 14 days, just still to avoid the expiration data to file an opposite motion for sanction the defendant was

DENIED

12/11/2024

Pat Stringer

Pat Stringer

1 of 10

Entered: Clerk, Circuit Court for
Baltimore County, MD
December 11, 2024

App. 10a

Appendix F

Memorandum Opinion and Order of the Circuit Court for Baltimore County in Case
No. C-03-CV-23-001953 (Dated [**December 05, 2024**])

Anthony Wheeler, Jr.
Plaintiff

v.

Giant of Maryland, LLC
Defendant

: IN THE

: CIRCUIT COURT

: FOR

: BALTIMORE COUNTY

: CASE NO: C-03-CV-23-1953

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFF'S SECOND
AMENDED COMPLAINT WITH PREJUDICE

HAVING CONSIDERED the Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint filed by Defendant Giant of Maryland LLC and the Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion to Dismiss with Prejudice and Request for Continued Discovery, along with the accompanying Memorandum of Point [sic] and Authorities filed, pro se, by the Plaintiff on December 2, 2024; and the matter having come on for argument before the undersigned on December 4, 2024, it is this 5th day of December, 2024, by the Circuit Court for Baltimore County ORDERED:

That the Defendant's Motion be and it is hereby GRANTED and this action is dismissed with prejudice in its entirety.

The United States District Court for the District of Maryland finally dismissed all of the Plaintiff's federal claims by Memorandum Opinion of September 11, 2024, declining to maintain jurisdiction over the remaining Maryland claims and remanding those claims to this Court.

The remaining claims – for wrongful termination and defamation under Maryland law must be dismissed as well under Maryland Rule 2-322(b)(2) and (c), the Plaintiff having been given reasonable opportunity to present all pertinent relevant material to a motion to dismiss or a motion for summary judgment. There is no viable claim for wrongful termination because the

Plaintiff has not maintained and cannot maintain that he was discharged from Giant for a reason that violates public policy. There is no viable claim for defamation because Plaintiff has not pointed and cannot point to a defamatory statement made by or attributable to the Defendant, or its agents.

For these reasons, dismissal of this action with prejudice, is required.

It is so ORDERED.


ROBERT E. CAHILL, JR., JUDGE

cc:
Raymond C. Baldwin, Esquire
Samantha L. Brooks, Esquire
Anthony Quinn Wheeler, Jr.

Entered: Clerk, Circuit Court for
Baltimore County, MD
December 5, 2024

**Additional material
from this filing is
available in the
Clerk's Office.**