

UNREPORTED
IN THE APPELLATE COURT
OF MARYLAND

No. 1384

September Term, 2022

JEREMY SHANE COCHRAN

v.

STATE OF MARYLAND

Wells, C.J.,
Shaw,
Zarnoch, Robert A.
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

PER CURIAM

Filed: February 27, 2023

*At the November 8, 2022, general election, the voters of Maryland ratified a constitutional amendment changing the name of the Court of Special Appeals of Maryland to the Appellate Court of Maryland. The name change took effect on December 14, 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.

Following a 2012 jury trial in the Circuit Court for Harford County, Jeremy Shane Cochran, appellant, was convicted of sexual abuse of a minor-continuing course of conduct, sexual abuse of a minor, and conspiracy to commit sexual abuse of a minor. This Court affirmed his convictions on direct appeal. *See Cochran v. State*, No. 86, Sept. Term 2013 (filed July 2, 2014).

In August 2022, appellant filed a “Motion for Improper and Defective Jury Instructions,” wherein he claimed that the trial court had erred in instructing the jury with respect to the charge of sexual abuse of a minor. The circuit court denied the motion without a hearing. On appeal, appellant contends that the court erred in denying that motion. However, his claim regarding the defective jury instructions is barred by the law of the case doctrine as it could have been raised in appellant’s direct appeal. *Holloway v. State*, 232 Md. App. 272, 282 (2017) (noting that the law of the case doctrine bars re-litigation not only of claims that were decided in prior appeals, but also any claims “that could have been raised and decided”). Consequently, we shall affirm the judgments of the circuit court.¹

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

¹ Appellant does not specifically assert that his sentence was illegal because of the allegedly defective jury instruction. However, to the extent he is contending that he was convicted of a charge that was not set forth in the indictment, a review of the record demonstrates that such a claim lacks merit.