## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

§
§ No. 389, 2011
§
§
§
§ Court Below—Superior Court
§ of the State of Delaware,
§ in and for Sussex County
§ Cr. ID 92S05720DI
§
§

Submitted: October 24, 2011 Decided: October 27, 2011

Before HOLLAND, BERGER, and JACOBS, Justices

## ORDER

This 27<sup>th</sup> day of October 2011, after careful consideration of the parties' briefs and the record on appeal, we find it manifest that the judgment below should be affirmed on the basis of the Superior Court's well-reasoned decision dated July 6, 2010. The Superior Court did not err in concluding that appellant's third motion for postconviction relief was both untimely and repetitive. Appellant had failed to overcome these procedural hurdles because, contrary to appellant's argument, this Court's decision in *Blake v. State*<sup>1</sup> did not create a newly recognized right.

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Blake v. State, 3 A.3d 1077 (Del. 2011).

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the judgment of the Superior Court is AFFIRMED.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Carolyn Berger
Justice