

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

CHARLES M. WILLIAMS,	§
	§
Defendant Below-	§ No. 389, 1999
Appellant,	§
	§
v.	§ Court Below—Superior Court
	§ of the State of Delaware,
STATE OF DELAWARE,	§ in and for New Castle County
	§ Cr.A. Nos. IN97-03-0600, -0601,
Plaintiff Below-	§ and -0602
Appellee.	§

Submitted: January 11, 2000  
Decided: March 24, 2000  
Corrected: March 28, 2000

Before **VEASEY**, Chief Justice, **WALSH**, and **BERGER**, Justices.

**ORDER**

This 28<sup>th</sup> day of March 2000, upon consideration of the briefs filed by the parties, it appears to the Court that:

(1) The appellant, Charles Williams, filed this appeal from the Superior Court's denial of his first petition for postconviction relief. In 1998 Williams pleaded guilty, pursuant to Superior Court Criminal Rule 11(e)(1)(C), to one count each of third degree unlawful sexual intercourse, second degree burglary, and third degree assault. The Superior Court sentenced Williams, consistent with his plea agreement, to a total term of fifteen years in jail, to be suspended

after five years for decreasing levels of supervision. Williams did not appeal to this Court from either his convictions or his sentences.

(2) Williams later filed a motion for postconviction relief asserting that his counsel had tricked him into signing the plea agreement. Williams contended that the plea agreement he signed only had an agreed-to sentence of five years in jail and did not include an additional ten years of supervision. Williams contended that when he tried later to object to the plea agreement, his attorney responded by promising him that he would serve only 30 months in jail. Williams further asserted that the prosecutor conspired with his counsel to get him to sign the allegedly fraudulent plea agreement. Finally, Williams contended that his trial counsel was ineffective in several other respects, including failing to investigate his case properly, failing to meet with him and interview him, failing to explain applicable legal principles and possible trial strategies and defenses, and for failing to review and explain to him the State's charges and the evidence against him.

(3) The Superior Court, in a thorough twelve page decision, denied the merits of Williams' claims. This Court, after considering the parties' briefs and the record in this case, has concluded that Williams' appeal should be affirmed

on the basis of the Superior Court's well-reasoned decision dated August 17, 1999.

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

BY THE COURT:

/s/ E. Norman Veasey  
Chief Justice