

Circuit Court for Washington County
Case No.: 21-K-11-045670

UNREPORTED
IN THE APPELLATE COURT
OF MARYLAND*

No. 1638

September Term, 2025

CHARLES WILLIAM SELBY, III

v.

STATE OF MARYLAND

Zic,
Tang,
Zarnoch, Robert A.
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

PER CURIAM

Filed: July 8, 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 2011, a jury in the Circuit Court for Washington County found Charles William Selby, III, guilty of twelve counts of sexual abuse of a minor, eight counts of sexual offense in the second-degree, and one count of sexual offense in the third degree. The sentencing court imposed a total term of 180 years' imprisonment, announcing the sentence as follows:

Count one – sexual abuse of a minor. Twenty years, Maryland Division of Corrections, consecutive to the last to expire of all outstanding Maryland sentences.

Count two – second degree sexual offense. Ten years, concurrent to count one.

Count three – third degree sexual offense. Three years, Maryland Division of Corrections, concurrent to count one.

Count four – sexual abuse of a minor. Twenty years, Maryland Division of Corrections, consecutive to count one.

Count five – second degree sexual offense. Ten years, concurrent.

Count six – aiding and abetting sexual abuse of a minor. Ten years, concurrent.

Count eight – sexual abuse of a minor. Twenty years, consecutive to count four.

Count nine – second degree sexual offense. Ten years, concurrent to count eight.

Count ten – sexual abuse of a minor. Twenty years, consecutive to count eight.

Count eleven – second degree sexual offense. Ten years, concurrent.

Count twelve – sexual abuse of a minor. Twenty years, consecutive to count ten.

Count thirteen – sexual abuse of a minor. Twenty years, consecutive to count twelve.

Count fourteen – second degree sexual offense. Ten years, concurrent.

Count fifteen – sexual abuse of a minor. Twenty years, consecutive to count thirteen.

Count sixteen – second degree sexual offense. Ten years, concurrent.

Count seventeen – aiding and abetting sexual abuse of a minor. Ten years, concurrent.

Count eighteen – aiding, abetting sexual abuse of a minor. Ten years, concurrent.

Count nineteen – sexual abuse of a minor. Twenty years, consecutive to count fifteen.

Count twenty – second degree sexual offense. Ten years, concurrent.

Count twenty-one – sexual abuse of a minor. Twenty years, consecutive to count nineteen.

Count twenty-two – sec - - second degree sexual offense. Ten years, concurrent.

The total executed time to be served – one hundred eighty years.

The commitment record filed in this case reflects the same sentences as announced in open court.

In 2025, Mr. Selby filed a paper he captioned “Motion To Correct Illegal Sentence.” In his motion, Mr. Selby sought “correction of the irregularity” in his sentence. He asserted that “[t]he sentencing court in [his] case did not apply Md. Rule 4-351(a)(5) correctly” because it failed to state the beginning and ending dates for the sentence imposed for each count. The circuit court summarily denied relief. We shall affirm the judgment.

Rule 4-351(a) provides that, “[w]hen a person is convicted of an offense and sentenced to imprisonment, the clerk shall deliver or transmit to the officer into whose

custody the defendant has been placed a commitment record containing,” among other things, “[a] statement whether sentences are to run concurrently or consecutively and, if consecutively, when each term is to begin with reference to termination of the preceding term or to any other outstanding or unserved sentence[.]” Mr. Selby interprets this provision to mean the court (and the clerk preparing the commitment record) must state the specific date each sentence begins and ends. We disagree.

The court in this case announced that the first sentence imposed (Count 1) would run consecutively to any outstanding Maryland sentence. In imposing sentence for the remaining counts, the court announced (and the commitment record reflects) the term of each sentence and whether it would run concurrently or consecutively. When imposing a consecutively run sentence, the court announced what count / sentence it was to run consecutively to. That is all the Rule requires.

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