

KARIM WARD

Appellant

v.

STATE OF MARYLAND

Appellee

*
IN THE
COURT OF SPECIAL APPEALS
OF MARYLAND

*
Application for Leave to Appeal
(Post-Conviction)

*
No. 0539

*
September Term, 2015

*
(CC# 21-K-03-032388)
*

AMENDED ORDER

Upon consideration of the Application for Leave to Appeal filed in the above-captioned case, and the State's Response, it is this 7th day of November, 2016, by the Court of Special Appeals

ORDERED that the Application for Leave to Appeal is granted, and the case be and hereby is transferred to this Court's direct appeal docket. It is further

ORDERED that on or before December 30, 2016, Appellant shall file his brief, in full compliance with the Maryland Rules, and shall address the following questions:

Did the post-conviction court abuse its discretion when it denied Ward's petition for post-conviction relief when it found that the defense was not prejudiced by the failure of defense counsel to object to comments by the prosecutor during closing argument and rebuttal "that intimated that witnesses were hesitant to come forward, or that witnesses were risking their lives by testifying?"

Did the post-conviction court abuse its discretion when it denied Ward's petition for post-conviction relief when it found that the defense was not prejudiced by the failure of defense counsel to object to a "golden rule" argument by the prosecutor during closing argument and rebuttal?

Did the post-conviction court abuse its discretion when it denied Ward's petition for post-conviction relief when it found that the defense was not prejudiced by the failure of defense counsel to object to the prosecutor's "ill-conceived" attempt to vouch for witnesses during closing argument and rebuttal?

Did the post-conviction court abuse its discretion when it denied Ward's petition for post-conviction relief when it found that defense counsel was not constitutionally ineffective when he/she failed to object to the prosecutor's comments during closing arguments about the intent of people who acquire illegal drugs which "telegraphed" to the jury that Ward had been previously convicted of a drug-related offense?

Did the post-conviction court abuse its discretion when it denied Ward's petition for post-conviction relief when it found that the defense was not prejudiced by the failure of defense counsel to request a jury instruction limiting the jury's consideration of Ward's stipulation that he had a prior conviction disqualifying him from possessing a handgun as to only the charge of possession of a firearm by a disqualified person and to no other offenses?

It is further

ORDERED that Appellee shall file its brief within 30 days after the filing of Appellant's brief. It is further

ORDERED that this case be argued during the Court session commencing

April 2017.

FOR A PANEL OF THE COURT

(CHIEF JUDGE'S SIGNATURE
APPEARS ON ORIGINAL ORDER)

Peter B. Krauser,
Chief Judge