

UNREPORTED
IN THE COURT OF SPECIAL APPEALS
OF MARYLAND

No. 126

September Term, 2016

SAMUEL JORDAN COX

v.

STATE OF MARYLAND

Krauser, C.J.,
Nazarian,
Moylan, Charles E., Jr.
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

PER CURIAM

Filed: May 2, 2017

*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.

Samuel Jordan Cox appeals the denial, by the Circuit Court for Baltimore County, of his motion to correct an illegal sentence. Because the issue he is raising is moot, we shall dismiss the appeal.

In 2009, pursuant to a plea agreement with the State, Cox pleaded guilty to second-degree assault and to a fourth-degree sexual offense. The court sentenced Cox to a total term of ten years' imprisonment, all suspended, and to a three-year period of supervised probation. Cox was not required to register as a sex offender. However, when the legislature thereafter amended the sex offender registration requirements, Cox's name was added to the sex offender registry. His name was subsequently removed from the registry following the decision by the Court of Appeals in *Doe v. Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services*, 430 Md. 535 (2013).

In 2014, Cox's probation was terminated and he was ordered to serve five years of his previously suspended sentence. In 2016, Cox filed a motion to correct an illegal sentence with the Circuit Court for Baltimore County, which focused on the fact that he had been required to register as a sex offender for a period of time, which he maintained was a violation of his plea agreement with the State. The circuit court denied the motion, prompting this appeal.

In light of the fact that Cox is no longer on the sex offender registry, the State has moved to dismiss the appeal as moot. In reply, Cox does not dispute that his name has been removed from the sex offender registry, but he maintains that "this appeal is ultimately about having a discussion about the disturbing collateral consequences caused by egregious ex post facto legislation." He further states that "this appeal is about

affording victims of punitive ex post facto legislation and illegal punishments the right to be heard, once the egregious legislation is repealed.” This appeal does not, alas, provide an appropriate forum for such a discussion.

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