

be considered a charging document under present §16-121, the citation must be only "duly attested". Under State v. Dodd and Baker, 17 Md. App. 693 (1973), it was held that present §§ 16-120 and 16-121, viewed together, do not require an oath or any other affirmation on a citation used as a charging document and a "signing" by the officer suffices to meet the requirement of present §16-121 that the citation be "duly attested".

In subsection (a) (3) of this section, the requirement that a citation be filed with "the District Court" is substituted for the present requirement, adopted directly from the corresponding UVC section, that it be filed "with a court having jurisdiction".

In subsection (b) of this section, the present, erroneously limited reference to a "violation of this article or moving violation of any traffic law or regulation of any local authority" is deleted; see §26-407(b) of this subtitle and the revisor's note to that section. It should be emphasized that no substantive change is intended by the deletion of the specific reference to "moving violations" under local law; the citations provided for under this subtitle may be issued in any event for any moving violation.

As to subsection (a) (1) of this section, the "information required under the laws of this State", see §26-205 of this title and §21-807 of this article.

#### 26-410. FEES FOR SHERIFFS.

NOTWITHSTANDING ANY LOCAL LAW TO THE CONTRARY, A SHERIFF IS NOT ENTITLED TO ANY FEE FOR SERVICES RENDERED IN CONNECTION WITH A PROSECUTION UNDER THE VEHICLE LAWS OF THIS STATE.

REVISOR'S NOTE: This section is new language derived without substantive change from Art. 66 1/2, §16-207.

This section is revised to state affirmatively that a sheriff is not entitled to a fee for services rendered under the vehicle laws of this State. This revision reaches the same result as - albeit more directly than - does present §16-207, which states that the sheriff is not entitled to any fee "in excess of the fees prescribed for sheriffs by §7-402 of the Courts Article...." Since CJ §7-402 is applicable only to civil cases, the net effect is to preclude fees for a "prosecution" under