

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

STATE OF DELAWARE

)

ID. No. 1808020395

In and For Kent County

v.

)

)

)

)

RODNEY WEST,

)

)

)

Defendant

)

Submitted: May 31, 2019

Decided: June 17, 2019

**ORDER**

This matter is currently before the Court on two motions *in limine* filed by Defendant—a Motion to Prohibit Inadmissible Testimonies and a Motion to Prohibit Prejudicial Questioning. The State has filed written responses to both motions. Although provided the opportunity to file replies to the State’s responses, Defendant has not done so.

The two motions filed by Defendant are absolutely devoid of legal authorities. As this Court has previously held, “in all but the simplest motions, counsel is required to develop a reasoned argument supported by pertinent authorities.”<sup>1</sup> Defendant has utterly failed to do so here.<sup>2</sup> As the *Gonzalez* Court observed, a Court

---


<sup>1</sup> *Gonzalez v. Carabello*, 2008 WL 4902686, at \*3 (Del. Super. Nov. 12, 2008).

<sup>2</sup> The Court notes that the State, by contrast, has filed responses that contain relevant authority and analysis of that authority. The State’s response to the Motion to Prohibit Prejudicial Questioning, in particular, is replete with relevant authority and detailed legal analysis.

should not be required to do “counsel’s work for him or her.”<sup>3</sup> This Court will not make Defendant’s arguments for him here—that is the job of defense counsel.

Accordingly, Defendant’s Motion to Prohibit Inadmissible Testimonies and Motion to Prohibit Prejudicial Questioning are both summarily **DENIED** without prejudice. Defendant will be allowed **10 days** from the date of this Order to file replacement motions addressing the same subjects and including pertinent legal authority and analysis thereof. Defendant is cautioned, however, not to include any additional factual issues, legal assertions, or subjects of inquiry not contained in the original motions.<sup>4</sup> The State may file supplemental responses within 10 days of the filing of the replacement motions or may stand upon its previous responses, and the State shall notify the Court of its intention in this regard upon the filing of the replacement motions. No additional replies by Defendant will be allowed.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Judge Noel Eason Primos

NEP/wjs

*Email*

oc: Prothonotary  
Joseph A. Hurley, Esquire  
Gregory R. Babowal, Esquire  
Sean A. Motoyoshi, Esquire

---

<sup>3</sup> *Id.* (citations omitted).

<sup>4</sup> In this regard, the Court notes that Defendant has filed a Motion for Leave to File Additional Motions in Limine, upon which the Court has **not** acted.