

Circuit Court for Prince George's County  
Case No.: CT96-1939A

UNREPORTED  
IN THE COURT OF SPECIAL APPEALS  
OF MARYLAND

No. 587

September Term, 2020

---

ERIC REYNOLDS

v.

STATE OF MARYLAND

---

Graeff,  
Ripken,  
Raker, Irma S.  
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

---

PER CURIAM

---

Filed: May 5, 2021

\*This is an unreported opinion, and it may not be cited in any paper, brief, motion, or other document filed in this Court or any other Maryland Court as either precedent within the rule of stare decisis or as persuasive authority. Md. Rule 1-104.

On November 12, 1997, pursuant to a binding guilty plea agreement, appellant, Eric Reynolds, pleaded guilty, in the Circuit Court for Prince George’s County, to first-degree murder, attempted first-degree murder, and use of a handgun in the commission of a crime of violence. On December 12, 1997, in accordance with the terms of the plea agreement, the court sentenced appellant to life imprisonment for first-degree murder, a concurrent term of life imprisonment for attempted first-degree murder, and to ten consecutive years’ imprisonment for the weapons offense.

Following the sentencing hearing, appellant filed a motion for modification or reduction of sentence, which the circuit court has held *sub curia* ever since. On February 5, 2020, appellant, through counsel, filed a written request for a hearing on his motion for modification or reduction of sentence. The circuit court thereafter denied appellant’s request for a hearing by way of a short order. That order explained that because appellant’s guilty plea was entered pursuant to a binding guilty plea agreement the court lacked the authority to modify the sentence without the State’s acquiescence. The court observed that the record did not indicate that the State consented to a reduction in sentence.

Appellant noted an appeal from the circuit court’s denial of his request for a hearing. With a few exceptions, a party has a right to file an appeal to this Court only when the circuit court has entered a final judgment. *See* Section 12-301 of the Courts & Judicial Proceedings Article. To constitute a final judgment, the judgment must have several attributes. One of which is that it must ““adjudicate or complete the adjudication of all claims against all parties[.]”” *See Board of Liquor License Commissioners for Baltimore City v. Fells Point Cafe, Inc.*, 344 Md. 120, 129 (1996) (quoting *Rohrbeck v. Rohrbeck*,

318 Md. 28, 41 (1989)). The denial of appellant’s request for a hearing did not adjudicate the merits of the still pending motion for modification or reduction of sentence. As a result, that ruling did not constitute a final judgment. We must, therefore, dismiss this appeal.

**APPEAL DISMISSED. COSTS TO BE  
PAID BY APPELLANT.**