

way every time. To that end, the Criminal Law 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 Criminal Law Article Review Committee that this bulk revision of the substantive criminal 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)

Accordingly, except to the extent that changes, which are noted in Revisor's Notes, clarify the former law, the enactment of this article in no way is intended to make any change to the substantive criminal law of Maryland.

In this article, as in other revised articles, the word "regulation" is substituted for the former references to "rules and regulations" to distinguish, to the extent possible, between regulations of executive units and rules of judicial or legislative units and to establish consistency in the use of the words. This substitution conforms to the practice of the Division of State Documents.

Also throughout this article, to be consistent and to avoid unnecessary confusion, the singular verb "adopt" is used in relation to rules or regulations, and verbs such as "prescribe" and "promulgate" are deleted. Regulations of State units, in any event, are subject to Title 10, Subtitle 1 of the State Government Article.

Also throughout this article, the term "unit" is substituted for former references to State entities such as an "agency", "department", "administration", "commission", and "office" except when a former reference indicated a specific entity, or as part of a defined term. The term "unit" is used as the general term for an organization in the State government because it is broad enough to include all such entities.

References to current units and positions are substituted for obsolete references to entities and positions that have been abolished or have otherwise ceased to exist.

The forms of standard charging documents formerly contained in Article 27 were intended to provide a simple, clear method of charging the relevant crimes without the procedural difficulties attendant in pleading at common law. The revision of those charging documents merely states the same substance in more modern language.

References to a person found guilty of a misdemeanor being "subject to § 5-106(b) of the Courts Article" are substituted for the former references to a person being "subject to imprisonment in the penitentiary" for accuracy and consistency with the Criminal Procedure Article. Provisions that make persons who are convicted of certain crimes liable for imprisonment "in the penitentiary" are obsolete in light of the