IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

MICHAEL A. BAILEY,[1]	§	
	§	
Petitioner Below,	§	No. 333, 2016
Appellant,	§	
	§	Court Below—Family Court
v.	§	of the State of Delaware
	§	
JACKIE J. JACKSON,	§	File No. CN08-05031
	§	Petition Nos. 13-38057, 14-05488,
Respondent Below,	§	and 14-16798
Appellee.	§	

Submitted: July 20, 2016
Decided: August 9, 2016

Before **STRINE**, Chief Justice; **HOLLAND** and **SEITZ**, Justices.

ORDER

This 9th day of August 2016, it appears to the Court that:

(1) We have before us an application for interlocutory review of a Family Court order, dated May 10, 2016, denying Michael A. Bailey's motion for discovery of an *ex parte* communication in visitation, rule to show cause, and custody proceedings. In a well-reasoned order dated June 30, 2016 and filed with this Court on July 20, 2016, the Family Court carefully considered the Rule 42(b) criteria and explained why interlocutory review was not warranted.

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

(2) Applications for interlocutory review are addressed to the sound discretion of this Court. In the exercise of its discretion, the Court has concluded, for the reasons stated by the Family Court, that the application for interlocutory review does not meet the requirements of Rule 42 and should be refused.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the interlocutory appeal is REFUSED.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Leo E. Strine, Jr.

Chief Justice