

right to the performance of the duty; (ii) no other adequate remedy is available; and (iii) the trial court has arbitrarily failed or refused to perform its duty.² Lowman's appointed counsel is not a judge. Thus, this Court has no jurisdiction to issue a writ directed to him.³ Also, to the extent Lowman claims that his counsel did not represent him effectively, he has an adequate remedy available to him in the postconviction process under Superior Court Criminal Rule 61.⁴

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the petition for an extraordinary writ of mandamus is DISMISSED.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Leo E. Strine, Jr.

Chief Justice

² *In re Bordley*, 545 A.2d 619, 620 (Del. 1988).

³ *In re Hitchens*, 600 A.2d 37, 38 (Del. 1991).

⁴ *In re Morris*, 2009 WL 3143615, *1 (Del. Sept. 30, 2009).