

STATE OF MARYLAND

\* IN THE

RECEIVED

v.

\* CIRCUIT COURT FOR

2015 OCT -5 AM 9:26

\* BALTIMORE CITY

CIRCUIT COURT  
BALTIMORE CITY  
CRIMINAL DIVISION

BRIAN RICE

\* Case No. 115141035

\* \* \* \* \*

**ORDER**

On June 26, 2015, the State filed its Initial Disclosures, Notices, and Motions. On September 16, 2015, the State filed its Notice of Intent to Use DNA. On September 18, 2015, the Defendant filed a Motion to Produce Records Regarding DNA Analysis. On September 22, 2015, the State filed a Supplemental Disclosure. On September 23, 2015, the State filed its Response to Defendant’s Motion to Produce Records Regarding DNA Analysis. This Court will address each issue presented.

1. For Requests under Paragraphs A, B, F, G, H, J, K and L, the State has responded that this discovery has been disclosed. This Court presumes that the State has, in fact, turned over the requested discovery. If the Defendant contends that he has not received the discovery, this Court will hear further arguments.
2. This Court finds Defendant’s request under Paragraph M and N is too broad and is subsequently denied.
3. This Court denies Defendant’s request under Paragraphs O and Q.
4. The State proffers that “to the best of the State’s knowledge,” the discovery requested in Paragraph C “is on file at the Baltimore Bar Library.” This Court finds this response insufficient and finds that Defendant is entitled to such information under Maryland Cts. & Jud. Proc. § 10-915(c)(2)(iii).
5. The State proffers that “to the best of the State’s knowledge,” the discovery requested in Paragraph D “is on file at the Baltimore Bar Library.” This Court finds this

response insufficient and finds that Defendant is entitled to such information under Maryland Cts. & Jud. Proc. § 10-915(c)(2)(ii) and (iii).

6. The State proffers that “to the best of the State’s knowledge,” the discovery requested in Paragraph E “is on file at the Baltimore Bar Library.” This Court finds this response insufficient and finds that Defendant is entitled to such information under Maryland Cts. & Jud. Proc. § 10-915(c)(2)(ii), (iii) and (v).
7. The State proffers that “to the best of the State’s knowledge,” the discovery requested in Paragraph I “is on file at the Baltimore Bar Library.” This Court finds this response insufficient and finds that Defendant is entitled to such information under Maryland Cts. & Jud. Proc. § 10-915(c)(2)(iii).
8. The State contends that “to the best of the State’s knowledge,” the discovery requested in Paragraph P “is on file at the Baltimore Bar Library.” This Court finds this response insufficient and finds that Defendant is entitled to such information under Maryland Cts. & Jud. Proc. § 10-915(c)(2)(ii) and (iii).

Upon consideration of the motion and response in this instance, and having found the State’s response in Paragraphs C, D, E, I, and P is insufficient, it is this 2nd day of October, 2015, by the Circuit Court for Baltimore City, hereby

**ORDERED** that the State disclose the documents requested by the Defendant in Paragraphs C, D, E, I, and P.

BARRY WILLIAMS - PART 31  
JUDGE

THE JUDGES SIGNATURE APPEARS  
ON THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

BARRY G. WILLIAMS  
JUDGE, CIRCUIT COURT FOR  
BALTIMORE CITY

Clerk, please mail copies to the following:

Michael Belsky, Attorney for Brian Rice

Janice Bledsoe, Deputy State’s Attorney, Office of the State’s Attorney for Baltimore City