

Circuit Court for Montgomery County  
Case No.: 108416C

UNREPORTED  
IN THE APPELLATE COURT  
OF MARYLAND\*

No. 1144

September Term, 2025

---

EDGAR CHRISTOPHER BRADFORD

v.

STATE OF MARYLAND

---

Arthur,  
Shaw,  
Beachley, Donald E.  
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

---

PER CURIAM

---

Filed: March 23, 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 2007, in the Circuit Court for Montgomery County, Edgar Christopher Bradford entered a guilty plea to third-degree sex offense and was sentenced to three years' imprisonment, with all but six months suspended, and a three-year term of supervised probation upon release. He did not seek leave to appeal.

In 2013, Mr. Bradford, through counsel, filed a petition for writ of error coram nobis in which he asserted, among other things, that his plea was not entered knowingly and voluntarily because he was not advised when he entered the plea (or at sentencing) that he would be required to register as a sex offender for life. He also alleged that his trial counsel provided ineffective assistance of counsel for failing to advise him of the lifetime sexual offender registration requirement and that the requirement was not mentioned at the sentencing hearing nor included in the order of probation. Following a hearing, the coram nobis court denied relief. Mr. Bradford did not appeal that decision.

Over ten years later, Mr. Bradford, representing himself, filed a motion with the circuit court seeking a hearing before the plea and sentencing judge. In that motion, Mr. Bradford asserted that his trial attorney and the Assistant State's Attorney "intentionally did not tell" either him or the trial judge of the sexual offender registration requirement and he wished to "go over" the "lies by omission[.]" The circuit court denied the request, prompting Mr. Bradford to note this appeal.

Mr. Bradford points to no authority that would mandate the hearing he requested in his motion. Moreover, his challenge to the sexual offender registration requirement was litigated in his petition for coram nobis relief and he points to no authority that would

permit him to relitigate that issue by simply requesting a hearing before the trial judge.

Accordingly, we affirm.

**JUDGMENT AFFIRMED. COSTS TO BE  
PAID BY APPELLANT.**