

Title 5, Subtitle 1 of the Courts Article, which establishes limitations periods for various kinds of actions.

14-1004. PLEADINGS.

THE FORM OF ANY PLEADING IN AN ACTION UNDER § 14-1001 OF THIS SUBTITLE SHALL BE GOVERNED BY THE MARYLAND RULES.

REVISOR'S NOTE: This section is new language substituted for former Art. 82, § 4 to reflect that, under current rules of civil procedure, the form and contents of pleadings are prescribed by the Maryland Rules. *See* Md. Rules 2-303 and 3-303.

GENERAL REVISOR'S NOTE TO SUBTITLE:

The Public Safety Article Review Committee notes, for consideration by the General Assembly, that former Article 82, §§ 1 through 4 of the Code (the "Riot Act"), were enacted in 1835 as a result of the bank riots which occurred in Baltimore in August 1835. Since its enactment, the "Riot Act" has been amended only once, in 1867, and apparently was last used to sue for damages sustained in the civil disorders that occurred in Baltimore in April 1968 following the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. (*see City of Baltimore v. Blibaum*, 280 Md. 652 (1977)). It is questionable whether the policies and premises underpinning the law are valid in today's society (for example, the policy of imposing liability on a local government to encourage local authorities and citizens to try to suppress a riot when today there are law enforcement agencies trained to control crime). The General Assembly may wish to review this law to determine whether it continues to serve a purpose in modern society.

GENERAL REVISOR'S NOTE TO ARTICLE:

The Department of Legislative Services is charged with revising the law in a clear, concise, and organized manner, without changing the effect of the law. One precept of revision has been that, once something is said, it should be said in the same way every time. To that end, the Public Safety Article Review Committee conformed the language and organization of this article to that of previously enacted revised articles to the extent possible.

It is the manifest intent both of the General Assembly and the Public Safety Article Review Committee that this bulk revision of the substantive public safety law of the State render no substantive change. The guiding principle of the preparation of this article is that stated in *Welch v. Humphrey*, 200 Md. 410, 417 (1952):

[T]he principal function of a Code is to reorganize the statutes and state them in simpler form. Consequently any changes made in them by a Code are presumed to be for the purpose of clarity rather than change of meaning. Therefore, even a change in the phraseology of a statute by a codification thereof will not ordinarily modify the law, unless the change is so radical and material that the intention of the Legislature to modify the law appears unmistakably from the language of the Code. (citations omitted)