

Circuit Court for Frederick County  
Case No. 10-K-12-052408

UNREPORTED  
IN THE COURT OF SPECIAL APPEALS  
OF MARYLAND

No. 1942

September Term, 2021

No. 158

September Term, 2022

---

MONTRELLE DENARD BOWIE

v.

STATE OF MARYLAND

---

Arthur,  
Tang,  
Raker, Irma S.  
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

---

PER CURIAM

---

Filed: August 24, 2022

\*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.

Montrelle Denard Bowie, appellant, appeals from the denials, by the Circuit Court for Frederick County, of his petitions for writs of actual innocence and error coram nobis. For the reasons that follow, we shall affirm the judgments of the circuit court.

In April 2013, Mr. Bowie pleaded guilty to first degree rape and kidnapping. The court subsequently sentenced Mr. Bowie to a total term of imprisonment of 60 years, all but 43 years suspended. In July 2021, Mr. Bowie filed a petition for writ of actual innocence. The petition is confusing, but as best we can determine, Mr. Bowie contended that at the time of the offenses, he was involuntarily intoxicated and suffering from schizophrenia and other mental health disorders, and hence, his convictions should be vacated. In September 2021, Mr. Bowie filed a petition for writ of error coram nobis, in which he contended that for numerous reasons, his plea was not entered in a voluntary, intelligent, or knowing manner. The court subsequently denied both petitions.

Mr. Bowie contends that for numerous reasons, the court erred in denying the petitions. We disagree. With respect to the petition for writ of actual innocence, the Court of Appeals has stated that such “relief . . . is limited to a petitioner who makes a threshold showing that he or she may be actually innocent, meaning he or she did not commit the crime.” *Faulkner v. State*, 468 Md. 418, 460 (2020) (internal citation and quotations omitted). Although Mr. Bowie disputes his mental capacity at the time that he committed the offenses of which he was convicted, he does not dispute that he committed the offenses, and hence, the court did not err in denying the petition for writ of actual innocence. With respect to the petition for writ of error coram nobis, the Court of Appeals has stated that one who “is incarcerated as a result of the challenged conviction or is on parole or

probation” is “not . . . entitled to coram nobis relief.” *Skok v. State*, 361 Md. 52, 80 (2000).

There is no evidence that Mr. Bowie has completed his term of imprisonment or any subsequent parole or probation, and hence, the court did not err in denying the petition for writ of error coram nobis.

**JUDGMENTS OF THE CIRCUIT COURT  
FOR FREDERICK COUNTY AFFIRMED.  
COSTS TO BE PAID BY APPELLANT.**