

Circuit Court for Baltimore City  
Case No. 24-H-16-000110

UNREPORTED  
IN THE COURT OF SPECIAL APPEALS  
OF MARYLAND

No. 2755

September Term, 2016

---

DONNELL RATCHFORD

v.

WARDEN, ECI

---

Woodward, C.J.,  
Eyler, Deborah S.,  
Moylan, Charles E., Jr.  
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

---

PER CURIAM

---

Filed: July 2, 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.

Donnell Ratchford, appellant, was convicted in the Circuit Court for Baltimore City of three counts of second degree murder and related offenses, and is serving a total sentence of ninety years. In 2016, Ratchford filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus, in which he contended that he “is being unlawfully confined and restrained,” because “he was in the primary custody and jurisdiction of New York [S]tate at the time he was seized by the [S]tate of Maryland,” and Maryland authorities improperly seized him “without consent from [S]tate of New York authorities.” The court denied the petition, noting that Ratchford “does not cite or refer to any authority for his . . . position,” and his “reference to the United States Constitution, the Bill of Rights[,] and other such material does not provide sufficient specificity as to how any such documents give rise to or support his position.” Ratchford appeals that decision.

Where a habeas corpus petitioner is challenging the legality of his conviction, as Ratchford does here, the circuit court’s denial of relief is not an appealable judgment. *Gluckstern v. Sutton*, 319 Md. 634, 652-53 (1990) (noting that an appeal of a decision on a petition for habeas corpus relief is permitted only where authorized by statute and no statute permits an appeal where the challenge is to the legality of the conviction); *Green v. Hutchinson*, 158 Md. App. 168, 174 (stating that where the arguments in support of habeas relief “went directly to the legality of [the petitioner’s] convictions,” there was no right to appeal the circuit court’s order denying relief), *cert. denied*, 383 Md. 212 (2004).

Even if Ratchford were entitled to appeal, we would affirm for the reasons set forth by the circuit court in its Memorandum Opinion and Order denying relief.

**APPEAL DISMISSED; COSTS TO BE PAID  
BY APPELLANT.**