

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

GINA GRANT,¹

Petitioner Below,
Appellant,

v.

MASON L. DAILEY,

Respondent Below,
Appellee.

§

§ No. 38, 2021

§

§ Court Below—Family Court
§ of the State of Delaware

§

§ File No. CS19-01117

§ Petition No. 19-02213

§

§

§

Submitted: February 18, 2022

Decided: February 28, 2022

Before **VAUGHN, TRAYNOR, and MONTGOMERY-REEVES**, Justices.

ORDER

After careful consideration of the supplemental briefs and the record on appeal, we conclude that the judgment below should be affirmed on the basis of the Family Court’s order following remand dated November 29, 2021. The appellee’s arguments challenge the Family Court’s factual findings regarding the parties’ income and expenses. On appeal from a Family Court order entered after a hearing, this Court accepts the trial court’s factual findings if they are sufficiently supported by the record and are the product of an orderly and logical deductive process.² Only when the factual findings are clearly wrong and justice requires that they be

¹ The Court previously assigned pseudonyms to the parties pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 7(d).

² *Garrison v. Downing*, 226 A.3d 195, 197 (Del. 2020).

overturned will this Court make contradictory findings.³ Moreover, when the determination of facts turns on a question of credibility and the acceptance or rejection of the testimony of the witnesses appearing before the trier of fact, this Court will not substitute its own opinion for that of the trier of fact.⁴ We do not find the findings of the Family Court to be clearly wrong, and we therefore find no basis for reversing the Family Court's order.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the judgment of the Family Court is AFFIRMED.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Gary F. Traynor
Justice

³ *Langford v. Langford*, 2019 WL 719039, at *1 (Del. Feb. 19, 2019).

⁴ *Shimel v. Shimel*, 2019 WL 2142066, at *2 (Del. May 14, 2019).