

Circuit Court for Montgomery County  
Case No. 85311C

UNREPORTED  
IN THE COURT OF SPECIAL APPEALS  
OF MARYLAND

No. 1854

September Term, 2017

---

TRENTON A. INGRAM

v.

STATE OF MARYLAND

---

Woodward, C.J.,  
Leahy,  
Moylan, Charles E., Jr.  
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

---

PER CURIAM

---

Filed: November 13, 2018

\*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.

Trenton A. Ingram, appellant, appeals from an order issued by the Circuit Court for Montgomery County denying his petition for writ of error coram nobis. He raises two issues on appeal: (1) whether the trial court erred in finding that his guilty plea was knowing and voluntary, and (2) whether his counsel at the hearing on his coram nobis petition was ineffective. For the reasons that follow, we affirm.

In 1999, Ingram pleaded guilty to one count of possession of cocaine with the intent to distribute and was sentenced to eighteen months in prison. In 2016, he filed a petition for writ of error coram nobis, claiming that he had received ineffective assistance of counsel and that his guilty plea was not knowing and voluntary because neither his counsel nor the court had explained all the elements of the charged offense. Following a hearing, the court denied Ingram’s petition, finding that: (1) his plea was knowing and voluntary, and (2) he had failed to establish that he was suffering from significant collateral consequences because of the conviction. This appeal followed.

On appeal, Ingram contends that the court erred in finding that his plea was knowing and voluntary. However, in denying Ingram’s petition, the court also found that he was not suffering or facing significant collateral consequences as a result of his conviction. The existence of significant collateral consequences is a prerequisite to obtaining coram nobis relief. *See State v. Rich*, 454 Md. 448, 462 (2017). Yet, Ingram has not challenged that finding on appeal, thereby waiving the issue. *See State v. Hobby*, 436 Md. 526, 542 (2014) (“[A] question not presented or argued in an appellant’s brief is waived or

abandoned and is, therefore, not properly preserved for review.” (citation omitted)). Consequently, we cannot say that the court erred in denying Ingram’s coram nobis petition.

Ingram also asserts that his counsel at the hearing on his coram nobis petition was ineffective in failing to object to certain leading questions that the prosecutor asked his former defense counsel. But even if we assume that there is a constitutional right to effective assistance of counsel in a coram nobis hearing, Ingram has not established that his counsel was ineffective. First, his counsel was not deficient in failing to object to the prosecutor’s leading questions because the court is not required to strictly apply the rules of evidence at a coram nobis hearing. *See* Md. Rule 15-1206. And, even if his counsel were deficient, Ingram could not establish prejudice, in light of the fact that he has not challenged the circuit court’s finding regarding the existence of significant collateral consequences on appeal.

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