

Circuit Court for Baltimore County
Case No. 03-K-04-001118

UNREPORTED
IN THE APPELLATE COURT
OF MARYLAND

No. 1726

September Term, 2023

GREGORY DANIEL LAMBERT

v.

STATE OF MARYLAND

Leahy,
Kehoe, S.,
Eyler, James R.
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

PER CURIAM

Filed: August 6, 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.

Following a 2005 jury trial in the Circuit Court for Baltimore County, Gregory Daniel Lambert, appellant, was convicted of first-degree murder and use of a handgun in the commission of a crime of violence. At the sentencing hearing, the court announced a sentence of life imprisonment on the first-degree murder count and a consecutive sentence of twenty years' imprisonment on the handgun count.

In 2023, appellant filed a motion to amend the commitment record. The motion did not specifically identify any error in the commitment record. Rather, it cited Maryland Rule 4-351 and summarily asserted that it “was not adhered to during his sentencing procedure.” The court denied the motion without a hearing. This appeal followed.

In his brief, appellant does not indicate why the court erred in denying the motion other than stating that the court did not “address[] or correct[] the error” in the commitment record. Consequently, we need not consider that issue on appeal. *See Diallo v. State*, 413 Md. 678, 692-93 (2010) (“[A]rguments not presented in a brief or not presented with particularity will not be considered on appeal.” (quotation marks omitted) (quoting *Klauenberg v. State*, 355 Md. 528, 552 (1999))). But in any event, we would find no error because: (1) the sentence pronounced by the court is the same sentence set forth in the commitment record, and (2) appellant’s motion did not indicate why the commitment record was otherwise incorrect.

Finally, appellant appears to contend that the court erred in denying the motion without holding a hearing. But a motion to correct a commitment record “does not require

a hearing in open court.” *Scott v. State*, 379 Md. 170, 191 (2004). Consequently, we shall affirm the judgment of the circuit court.

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