

Circuit Court for Montgomery County  
Case No. 126945C

UNREPORTED  
IN THE APPELLATE COURT  
OF MARYLAND

No. 1302

September Term, 2024

---

AWA DULLEH

v.

STATE OF MARYLAND

---

Nazarian,  
Arthur,  
Zarnoch, Robert A.  
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

---

PER CURIAM

---

Filed: July 9, 2025

\*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.

Awa Dulleh, appellant, appeals from the denial, by the Circuit Court for Montgomery County, of a motion to correct illegal sentence.<sup>1</sup> For the reasons that follow, we shall affirm the judgment of the circuit court.

In March 2015, Mr. Dulleh was charged by indictment as follows:

- Count One: Armed robbery of Melanie Levy.
- Count Two: Armed robbery of Maria Shea.
- Count Three: Conspiracy to commit armed robbery of Melanie Levy.
- Count Four: Conspiracy to commit armed robbery of Maria Shea.

Following the close of the evidence, the court submitted to the jury a verdict sheet that listed the charges against Mr. Dulleh as follows:

- Count 1, robbery with a dangerous weapon of Melanie Levy.
- Count 2, robbery of Melanie Levy.
- Count 3, robbery with a dangerous weapon of Maria Shea.
- Count 4, robbery of Maria Shea.
- Count 5, conspiracy to commit robbery with a dangerous weapon of Melanie Levy.
- Count 6, conspiracy to commit robbery of Melanie Levy.
- Count 7, conspiracy to commit robbery with a dangerous weapon of Maria Shea.
- Count 8, conspiracy to commit robbery of Maria Shea.

The jury subsequently indicated on the verdict sheet that they had found Mr. Dulleh guilty of Counts 1, 3, 5, and 7. The jury did not return verdicts as to Counts 2, 4, 6, and 8. When the jury returned to the courtroom, the foreperson announced that the jury had found Mr. Dulleh guilty of Counts 1, 3, 5, and 7. The court polled the jury, which confirmed the verdicts.

---

<sup>1</sup>Mr. Dulleh also purports to appeal from the denial of a “Motion to Overturn/Reverse and Vacate Illegal Conviction Ensued Wrongful Conviction.” But, Mr. Dulleh failed to file a notice of appeal from the denial of that motion. Hence, that judgment is not before us.

At sentencing, the court stated:

[W]ith respect to the charge of armed robbery, which is Count 1 in Criminal No. 126945, I'll impose a sentence of 10 years to the Department of Corrections to run consecutive to any sentence that you are currently serving. . . .

As to Count 3, which is conspiracy, that sentence is 10 years to run concurrent with the sentence I've imposed on Count[] 1.

Count 2, armed robber[y], I'll impose a sentence of 10 years to run consecutive to the sentence that I've imposed on Count 1.

As to Count 4, conspiracy to commit armed robbery, I'll impose a sentence of 10 years to run concurrent with the sentence I've imposed on Count 2.

On appeal, we vacated one of the convictions and sentences for conspiracy, and otherwise affirmed the judgments of the circuit court. *Dulleh v. State*, No. 478, Sept. Term, 2016 (filed June 20, 2017), slip op. at 22-23.

In March 2024, Mr. Dulleh filed the motion to correct illegal sentence, in which he contended that:

- The sentencing court erred “when it sentenced [Mr.] Dulleh ‘as to Count 3 which is conspiracy’ contrary to the fact [that] the jury never[] returned a guilty verdict ‘as to Count 3 conspiracy’ but . . . instead . . . returned a guilty verdict ‘as to Count 3, robbery with a dangerous weapon, victim Maria Shea.’”
- The sentencing court erred “when it sentenced [Mr.] Dulleh ‘Count 2, armed robber[y]’ contrary to the fact that the jury . . . never[] returned a guilty verdict of ‘Count 2, armed robber[y].’”
- The sentencing court erred “when it sentenced [Mr. Dulleh] ‘as to Count 4, conspiracy to commit armed robbery’ contrary to the fact that the jury . . . never[] returned a guilty verdict . . . ‘as to Count 4, conspiracy to commit armed robbery.’”

The court denied the motion.

Mr. Dulleh contends that, for numerous reasons, the court erred in denying the motion. We disagree. Although the counts cited by the sentencing court do not numerically match those cited by the jury in the verdict sheet or the verdicts announced by the foreperson, it is clear from the totality of the record that the court intended to impose upon Mr. Dulleh a term of imprisonment of ten years for the armed robbery of Ms. Levy, a consecutive term of imprisonment of ten years for the armed robbery of Ms. Shea, and a concurrent term of imprisonment for the conspiracy to commit armed robbery of those individuals. The sentencing court did not impose upon Mr. Dulleh a term of imprisonment for any offense of which he was not convicted by the jury, and hence, the court did not err in denying the motion to correct illegal sentence.

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