IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

```
TIMOTHY W. BRADLEY, indi-
vidually and as Class representative
                                §
                                §
for the non-moot claims of the
                                §
certified class,
                                §
          Plaintiff Below,
          Appellant,
                                § No. 445, 1999
                                § Court Below: Court of Chancery
     V.
                                § of the State of Delaware in and
FIRST INTERSTATE BANCORP.
                                § for New Castle County
EDWARD M. CARSON, WILLIAM§ C.A. No. 14623
S. RANDALL, WILLIAM E.B.
SIART, JOHN E. BRYSON, JEWEL§
PLUMMER COBB, RALPH P.
                                §
DAVIDSON, MYRON duBAIN,
DON C. FRISBEE, GEORGE M.
KELLER, THOMAS L. LEE,
WILLIAM F. MILLER, STEVEN B.§
SAMPLE, FORREST N.
                                §
SHUMWAY, RICHARD J.
                                §
                                §
STEGEMEIER, DANIEL M.
TELLEP, AND FIRST BANK §
                                §
SYSTEM, INC.,
                                §
                                §
          Defendants Below,
                                §
          Appellees.
```

Submitted: March 14, 2000 Decided: March 21, 2000

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

ORDER

This 21st day of March 2000, upon consideration of the briefs of the parties and oral argument, the Court concludes that, in ruling that Plaintiff

Below-Appellant had pleaded derivative claims, the Court of Chancery

correctly applied the standards announced by this Court in Kramer v. Western

Pacific Indus., Del. Supr., 546 A.2d 348, 354 (1988) and Parnes v. Bally

Entertainment Corp., Del. Supr., 722 A.2d 1243, 1245 (1999). Accordingly,

Appellant lacks standing to assert those claims. See Lewis v. Anderson, Del.

Supr., 477 A.2d 1040 (1984). We further conclude that Appellant's

California state law claims are exclusively controlled by Delaware law under

the internal affairs doctrine. See McDermott, Inc. v. Lewis, Del. Supr., 531

A.2d 206, 215 (1987).

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the judgment of the

Court of Chancery be, and the same hereby is,

AFFIRMED.

BY THE COURT:

s/Joseph T. Walsh
Justice

2