

UNREPORTED  
IN THE APPELLATE COURT  
OF MARYLAND

No. 637

September Term, 2024

---

LESTER AARON SNYDER

v.

STATE OF MARYLAND

---

Leahy,  
Zic,  
Harrell, Glenn T., Jr.  
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

---

PER CURIAM

---

Filed: March 6, 2025

\*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.

Following a 2014 jury trial in the Circuit Court for Carroll County, Lester Aaron Snyder, appellant, was convicted of first-degree premeditated murder, felony murder, robbery with a dangerous weapon, and other related offenses. Prior to trial, the court granted the State’s motion to amend the indictment to change the date of the offenses from October 1, 2014, to October 4, 2014. This Court affirmed the judgments in an unreported opinion. *Snyder v. State*, No. 1848, Sept. Term 2015 (filed Mar. 21, 2017).

In March 2024, appellant filed a motion to dismiss the indictment, claiming that the original indictment had “failed to inform him of the charges against him” and that “all information and evidence presented to the Grand Jury was false, fictitious, and fraudulent” because the indictment “mentioned crimes on or about October 1, 2014” while the victim was pronounced dead on October 4, 2014. The court denied the motion without a hearing. This appeal followed. On appeal, appellant contends that the court erred in denying the motion to dismiss the indictment and in not holding a hearing on that motion. The State has moved to dismiss the appeal as not allowed by law. For the reasons that follow, we shall grant the motion to dismiss the appeal.

Appellant cites to no authority authorizing the motion he filed in the circuit court. And we are aware of none. For that reason alone, the circuit court did not err in denying appellant’s motion. Moreover, in our view, appellant is not entitled to pursue a direct appeal from a proceeding unauthorized by law. “In Maryland, criminal defendants do not have a constitutional right to appeal. Instead, the right to seek appellate review is statutory; the Legislature can provide for, or preclude it.” *Douglas v. State*, 423 Md. 156, 170 (2011) (cleaned up). Section 12-301 of the Courts & Judicial Proceedings Article provides, with

exceptions not here pertinent, that “a party may appeal from a final judgment entered in a civil or criminal case by a circuit court.” “A final judgment is one that either determines and concludes the rights of the parties involved or denies a party the means to prosecute or defend his or her rights and interests in the subject matter of the proceeding.” *Douglas*, 423 Md. at 171 (cleaned up).

The motion appellant filed in this case is not recognized by law in a criminal case. Its denial, therefore, does not constitute a final judgment, and is not, therefore, appealable. If we were to hold that the denial of this motion was appealable, then litigants who invent their own method of litigation unauthorized by law would then create for themselves greater appellate rights than litigants who follow extant law and procedure. That cannot be the law. Consequently, pursuant to Maryland Rule 8-602, we dismiss this appeal.

**MOTION TO DISMISS APPEAL  
GRANTED. COSTS TO BE PAID BY  
APPELLANT.**