

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

D' ANDRE ROGERS,	§
	§ No. 169, 2013
Defendant Below-	§
Appellant,	§
v.	§ Court Below—Superior Court
	§ of the State of Delaware
	§ in and for New Castle County
STATE OF DELAWARE,	§ Cr. ID No. 0901003188
	§
Plaintiff Below-	§
Appellee.	§

Submitted: April 8, 2013

Decided: April 10, 2013

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

ORDER

This 10th day of April 2013, it appears to the Court that:

(1) On April 1, 2013, the Court received the appellant's notice of appeal from the Superior Court's order denying his motion for postconviction relief pursuant to Superior Court Criminal Rule 61, which was signed and docketed on February 22, 2013. Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 6, a timely notice of appeal from the February 22, 2013 order should have been filed on or before March 25, 2013.

(2) On April 2, 2013, the Clerk issued a notice pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 29(b) directing the appellant to show cause why his appeal should not be dismissed as untimely. The appellant filed his response to the

notice to show cause on April 8, 2013. The appellant states that he thought he had mailed his notice of appeal in enough time to reach the Supreme Court in a timely manner. He asks the Court not to dismiss his appeal.

(3) Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 6(a) (iii), a notice of appeal in any proceeding for postconviction relief must be filed within 30 days after entry upon the docket of the judgment or order being appealed. 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 Rule 6.³ Unless the appellant can demonstrate that the failure to file a timely notice of appeal is attributable to court-related personnel, his appeal may not be considered.⁴

(4) There is nothing in the record before us reflecting that the appellant'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 this appeal must be dismissed.

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

² Supr. Ct. R. 10(a).

³ *Carr v. State*, 554 A.2d at 779.

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

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

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Myron T. Steele
Chief Justice