

UNREPORTED
IN THE APPELLATE COURT
OF MARYLAND

No. 2047

September Term, 2023

ROBERT HAUGHIE

v.

YES CARE

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

JJ.

PER CURIAM

Filed: August 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.

Robert Haughie, appellant, is a prisoner at Western Correctional Institution, and receives medical care from Yes Care, appellee. In October 2023, appellant filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus in the Circuit Court for Allegany County claiming that Yes Care was “placing [his] life in danger and [] violating [his] constitutional right to be free from cruel and unusual punishment” by denying him “adequate medical services.” As relief, he requested the court to order that he be seen by doctors “independent of DOC and Yes Care” and that “all services be paid by Yes Care and DOC.” The court denied the petition without a hearing for failure to comply with Maryland Rule 15-302. This appeal followed.

On appeal, appellant contends that the court erred in denying his habeas petition. We disagree and shall affirm. Maryland Rule 15-303(e)(2) provides that if a habeas petition “fails to comply with the provisions of Rule 15-302” the court may deny the petition. In addition to other requirements, Rule 15-302 requires that any petition for writ of habeas corpus “shall be supported by affidavit of the petitioner[.]” Appellant’s petition, however, was not supported by affidavit. Consequently, we hold that the court did not err in denying appellant’s petition for writ of habeas corpus.¹

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

¹ In affirming the judgment, we do not address the merits of appellant’s habeas petition. Moreover, nothing in this opinion should be construed as preventing appellant from filing a new habeas petition that complies with Rule 15-302.