IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

LINDA V. CARTER,1 § § No. 481, 2008 Petitioner Below-§ Appellant, § § Court Below—Family Court V. § of the State of Delaware, § in and for New Castle County RONNIE LAY, SR., § File No. CN02-06391 Respondent Below-§ Pet. No. 07-20674 Appellee.

> Submitted: October 1, 2008 Decided: December 15, 2008

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

ORDER

This 15th day of December 2008, it appears to the Court that:

- (1) On September 19, 2008, the Court received Linda Carter's notice of appeal from a Family Court order dated August 29, 2007. Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 6, a timely notice of appeal should have been filed on or before September 28, 2007.
- (2) The Clerk issued a notice pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 29(b) directing Carter to show cause why the appeal should not be dismissed

 $^{^{1}\,}$ The Court assigned pseudonyms to the parties pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 7(d).

as untimely filed.² Carter responded on October 1, 2008. She contends that she filed her appeal almost a year late because she was not aware that she could file an appeal earlier.

- (3) Time is a jurisdictional requirement.³ A notice of appeal must be received by the Office of the Clerk of this Court within the applicable time period in order to be effective.⁴ An appellant's pro se status does not excuse a failure to comply strictly with the jurisdictional requirements of Supreme Court Rule 6.⁵ Unless the appellant can demonstrate that the failure to file a timely notice of appeal is attributable to court-related personnel, her appeal cannot be considered.⁶
- (4) There is nothing in the record to substantiate a claim that Carter's failure to file a timely notice of appeal in this case is attributable to court-related personnel. Consequently, this case does not fall within the exception to the general rule that mandates the timely filing of a notice of appeal. Thus, the Court concludes that the within appeal must be dismissed.

²Del. Supr. Ct. R. 6(a)(ii).

³Carr v. State, 554 A.2d 778, 779 (Del.), cert. denied, 493 U.S. 829 (1989).

⁴Del. Supr. Ct. R. 10(a).

⁵Carr v. State, 554 A.2d at 779.

⁶Bey v. State, 402 A.2d 362, 363 (Del. 1979).

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED, pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 29(b), that the within appeal is DISMISSED.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Myron T. Steele Chief Justice