## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

IN THE MATTER OF THE § PETITION OF CARL J. HASKINS § FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT § NUNC PRO TUNC §

No. 195, 2008

Submitted: May 28, 2008 Decided: July 10, 2008

## Before STEELE, Chief Justice, HOLLAND and RIDGELY, Justices.

## <u>ORDER</u>

This 10<sup>th</sup> day of July 2008, the Court has considered the "petition for declaratory judgment nunc pro tunc" filed by the petitioner, Carl J. Haskins, the motion to dismiss filed by the respondent, State of Delaware, pursuant to Supreme Court Rules 29(b) and 30(d), and Haskins' response to the motion to dismiss. It is clear that the "petition for declaratory judgment nunc pro tunc" is lacking in any averments to invoke the original jurisdiction of this Court.<sup>1</sup> It further appears that the Court has previously rejected the underlying substantive issues that Haskins attempts to raise in the petition.<sup>2</sup>

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the motion to dismiss is GRANTED. The "petition for declaratory judgment nunc pro tunc" is DISMISSED.

BY THE COURT:

<u>/s/ Myron T. Steele</u> Chief Justice

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See Del. Const. art. IV, § 11 (defining Court's jurisdiction) (2007).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See Haskins v. Williams, 2007 WL 704122 (Del. Supr.) (affirming denial of certiorari and habeas corpus petitions).