

Circuit Court for Baltimore County
Case No. 03-K-04-001118

UNREPORTED
IN THE APPELLATE COURT
OF MARYLAND

No. 1810

September Term, 2024

GREGORY DANIEL LAMBERT

v.

STATE OF MARYLAND

Nazarian,
Arthur,
Zarnoch, Robert A.
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

PER CURIAM

Filed: July 11, 2025

*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.

Gregory Daniel Lambert, appellant, challenges the denial, by the Circuit Court for Baltimore County, of an “Amendment to Motion to Correct Illegal Sentence” (hereinafter “amended motion to correct”). For the reasons that follow, we shall affirm the judgment of the circuit court.

In 2005, Mr. Lambert was convicted by a jury of first degree murder and use of a handgun in the commission of a crime of violence. At sentencing, the court sentenced Mr. Lambert as follows:

Count One, the Defendant will be sentenced to the Division of Correction for the rest of his natural life accounting from March 8th, 2004.

As to Count Three, 20 years to the Division of Correction, first five of which must be served without the possibility of parole, consecutive to Count One.

On August 30, 2024, Mr. Lambert filed a motion to correct illegal sentence. On September 18, 2024, Mr. Lambert filed the amended motion to correct “pursuant to” Rule 4-345(b) (“[t]he court has revisory power over a sentence in case of fraud, mistake, or irregularity”). In the amended motion, Mr. Lambert contended that his sentence contains a “clerical error,” because the sentencing court failed to specify a date on which his term of imprisonment for first degree murder is to end, and his term of imprisonment for use of a handgun in the commission of a crime of violence is to commence, in violation of Rule 4-351(a)(5) (a commitment record must contain 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”). The court denied the amended motion.

Mr. Lambert contends that the court erred in denying the amended motion, because the sentencing court's failure to "state on record when [the] life sentence would be terminated and when [the] twenty . . . year consecutive sentence would begin" constitutes "an irregularity." We disagree for two reasons. First, a term of imprisonment "for the rest of [a defendant's] natural life" terminates upon the end of the defendant's natural life. Second, Mr. Lambert does not cite any authority that interprets Rule 4-351(a)(5) to require a sentencing court to specify a date on which a term of life imprisonment is to end. There is no irregularity in the sentence, and hence, the court did not err in denying the amended motion to correct.

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