

Circuit Court for Baltimore City
Case Nos.: 105073029, 030

UNREPORTED
IN THE APPELLATE COURT
OF MARYLAND*

No. 1930

September Term, 2025

TEON HALL

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 2006, a jury in the Circuit Court for Baltimore City found Teon Hall guilty of second-degree murder (victim #1), first-degree assault (victim #2), two counts use of a handgun in the commission of a crime of violence (one count per victim), and unlawfully wearing or carrying a handgun. The court sentenced Hall to 30 years' imprisonment for second-degree murder, a consecutive term of 20 years for use of a handgun in the commission of a crime of violence (second-degree murder), a consecutive term of 25 years for first-degree assault, and a consecutive term of 20 years for use of a handgun in the commission of a crime of violence (first-degree assault). The court merged the wear, carry offense for sentencing purposes. The total term was 95 years' imprisonment. After pronouncing sentence, the judge reiterated that "[i]t's all consecutive" and said he wanted to "explain why." The judge then stated:

What you did was in a word senseless. It made no sense. I'm practically speechless. And the danger is if and when you are released, you could do it again because at least the jury believed that you drank to the extent that you did not premeditate anything, but one person was killed and another severely wounded.

Upon direct appeal, this Court affirmed the judgment. *Hall v State*, No. 1403, September Term, 2006 (filed unreported January 22, 2008).

Following a hearing held on December 7, 2015, the court modified Hall's sentence, stating as follows:

Count 1 was 30 years for the second-degree murder. Count 2 was use of a handgun in the commission of a crime of violence that were to run consecutive. I'm going to modify the sentence by running it concurrent with the 30-year sentence.

There is another conviction, which is referred to as Count 4 on the commitment record, of use of a handgun in the crime of violence, consecutive. I’m going to run that concurrent, **leaving a balance of his sentence of 55 years.**

(Emphasis added.)¹

The judge told Hall: “I’m reducing your sentence, not because you didn’t deserve the sentences that you got, I’m reducing them because you’ve made great strides.”

In 2025, Hall, representing himself, filed a motion to correct the commitment record. He asserted that, when modifying his sentence in 2015, the judge failed to mention the first-degree assault offense, thereby creating an ambiguity in the sentencing package. The circuit court—noting that Hall had made the same allegation in two previously filed and denied motions—denied relief. In its order denying Hall’s motion to correct an illegal sentence, filed on July 31, 2024, the court found,

[N]o illegality in [Hall’s] sentence because the sentence for first-degree assault was not modified. It continued to be a consecutive 25 years. The modifications were Judge Alpert’s decision to run the two 20-year sentences for use of a handgun in commission of crimes of violence concurrently rather than consecutively. That change gave [Hall] an overall sentence reduction of forty years.

On appeal, Hall asserts, as he did in his motion(s) in the circuit court, that in modifying his sentence in 2015, the court “did not orally announce or re-impose” a sentence for first-degree assault. He maintains, therefore, that the clerk erred in including the 25-year sentence for first-degree assault in the commitment record issued in 2015

¹ The transcript of the December 7, 2015 hearing is not in the record before us. Hall has attached a portion of the transcript, however, to his appellate brief. The State does not question the authenticity of that excerpt.

following the sentencing modification hearing. The State responds that the only sentences the court modified in 2015 were the two sentences for use of a handgun in the commission of a crime of violence, and it left the sentences for second-degree murder and first-degree assault “undisturbed as they were originally pronounced in 2006.” The State points out this was clear, as the judge stated that the modification it had just announced left “a balance of his sentence of 55 years.”

In a reply brief, Hall asserts that during the original sentencing hearing in 2006, the court failed to “specify whether” the sentences imposed were to run “concurrently or consecutively to each other[.]” Although he acknowledges that the court did state “all sentences consecutive[.]” he seems to maintain that the sentencing package was ambiguous, especially with regard to the sentence for first-degree assault.

We find no merit to Hall’s contentions. In 2006, the court unambiguously ran each sentence consecutively to each other for a total term of 95 years’ imprisonment. We agree with the State that in 2015, the court modified the handgun sentences only by running them concurrent with the related felonies, that is concurrently with second-degree murder in case ending in 029 and concurrently with first-degree assault in case ending in 030, leaving a total term of 55 years. The court simply pulled the handgun sentences from the consecutively run line up, and ran them concurrently with the corresponding felony, leaving the 25-year sentence for first-degree assault running consecutively to the 30-year sentence for second-degree murder.

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