

timely because he received the Superior Court order on June 11, 2016 and this Court received his notice of appeal within thirty days (on July 11, 2016).

(3) Time is a jurisdictional requirement.¹ 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.² An appellant's *pro se* status does not excuse a failure to comply strictly with the jurisdictional requirements of Supreme Court Rule 6.³ Unless an appellant can demonstrate that the failure to file a timely notice of appeal is attributable to court-related personnel, an untimely appeal cannot be considered.⁴

(4) The time to take an appeal from a postconviction order runs from the docketing of the postconviction order, not receipt of the order as the appellant claims.⁵ The appellant does not claim, and the record does not reflect, that his failure to file a timely notice of appeal 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. This appeal must be dismissed.

¹ *Carr v. State*, 554 A.2d 778, 779 (Del. 1989).

² Supr. Ct. R. 10 (a); *Smith v. State*, 47 A.3d 481, 482 (Del. 2012).

³ *Carter v. State*, 2013 WL 5974913, at *1 (Del. Nov. 8, 2013) (citing *Carr*, 554 A.2d at 779).

⁴ *Bey v. State*, 402 A.2d 362, 363 (Del. 1979).

⁵ Supr. Ct. R. 6(a)(iv).

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED, under Supreme Court Rule 29(b),
that this appeal is DISMISSED.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Randy J. Holland
Justice