

UNREPORTED
IN THE APPELLATE COURT
OF MARYLAND

No. 993

September Term, 2025

CLARK MCKNIGHT

v.

STATE OF MARYLAND

Wells, C.J.,
Albright,
Meredith, Timothy E.
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

PER CURIAM

Filed: February 20, 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.

In 2013, a jury in the Circuit Court for Prince George’s County convicted Clark McKnight, appellant, of first-degree murder, robbery with a dangerous weapon, and robbery. The court sentenced him to a total term of life imprisonment, plus 10 years. In 2025, appellant filed a motion for a substance abuse evaluation and commitment for substance abuse treatment pursuant to Health-General Article §§ 8-505 and 507. The court denied the motion without a hearing, noting that it had considered the entire “record herein, including, but not limited, to [appellant’s] 2013 representation in the Pre-Sentence Investigation (PSI) that he had no alcohol or substance abuse issues[.]” This appeal followed. On appeal, appellant contends that the court abused its discretion in denying the motion because there “is an indication [in the record] that [he] has some history with drugs” and that he was not required to “admit to a dependency at some previous point in time” to be eligible for relief. The State has filed a motion to dismiss the appeal as not allowed by law. For the reasons that follow, we shall grant the motion to dismiss.

The State maintains that the court’s denial of appellant’s motion is not an appealable order and moves to dismiss the appeal for that reason. We agree. Neither Health-General § 8-505 nor § 8-507 provide for appellate review of a decision to deny a request for substance abuse evaluation or commitment for treatment. Moreover, in *Fuller v. State*, 397 Md. 372, 394-95 (2007), the Supreme Court of Maryland held that an order denying a motion for commitment for treatment pursuant to Health-General § 8-507 is not a final order or an appealable collateral order because there is no limit on the number of motions a defendant may file. Finally, this Court’s decision in *Hill v. State*, 247 Md. App. 377 (2020), which addressed a decision denying relief under Health-General § 8-507, is

distinguishable because, unlike in *Hill*, the record in this case does not reflect that the circuit court believed it lacked authority to grant appellant’s motion.

In sum, we hold that the court’s order denying appellant’s request for substance abuse evaluation is not an appealable judgment. Therefore, we shall grant the State’s motion to dismiss.

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