

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

ALFRED BLOUNT,	§	
	§	No. 537, 2008
Plaintiff Below,	§	
Appellant,	§	Court Below—Superior Court
	§	of the State of Delaware in and
v.	§	for New Castle County
	§	
CREATIVE TRAVEL,	§	
	§	
Defendant Below,	§	C.A. No. 07A-11-006
Appellee.	§	

Submitted: November 14, 2008  
Decided: December 16, 2008

Before **STEELE**, Chief Justice, **HOLLAND** and **BERGER**, Justices.

**ORDER**

This 16<sup>th</sup> day of December 2008, it appears to the Court that:

(1) On October 27, 2008, the Court received Alfred Blount's untimely notice of appeal from the Superior Court's memorandum opinion of September 10, 2008 that affirmed a decision of the Unemployment Insurance Appeal Board. Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 6, a timely notice of appeal should have been filed on or before October 10, 2008.<sup>1</sup>

(2) On October 28, 2008, the Clerk issued a notice directing that Blount show cause why the appeal should not be dismissed as untimely

---

<sup>1</sup> Del. Supr. Ct. R. 6(a).

filed.<sup>2</sup> Blount filed a response to the notice to show cause on November 14, 2008. Blount’s response does not address the jurisdictional issue raised in the notice to show cause.

(3) Under Delaware law, a notice of appeal must be received by the Office of the Clerk within the applicable time period to be effective.<sup>3</sup> Unless an appellant can demonstrate that the failure to timely file a notice of appeal is attributable to court-related personnel, an untimely appeal cannot be considered.<sup>4</sup>

(4) Blount does not contend, and the record does not reflect, that his failure to timely file the notice of appeal is attributable to court-related personnel. This case does not fall within the exception to the general rule that mandates the timely filing of a notice of appeal.

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

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Randy J. Holland  
Justice

---

<sup>2</sup> Del. Supr. Ct. R. 29(b).

<sup>3</sup> See *Carr v. State*, 554 A.2d 778, 779 (Del. 1989) (stating that “[t]ime is a jurisdictional requirement”); Del. Supr. Ct. R. 10(a).

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