

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

CHAD COLLINS, ¹	§	
	§	No. 632, 2011
Respondent Below,	§	
Appellant,	§	Court Below—Family Court of
	§	the State of Delaware in and for
v.	§	Kent County
	§	
DIVISION OF FAMILY	§	
SERVICES,	§	
	§	File No. CK10-03157
Petitioner Below,	§	Pet. No. 11-31598
Appellee.	§	

Submitted: December 7, 2011
Decided: December 21, 2011

Before **BERGER. JACOBS** and **RIDGELY**, Justices.

ORDER

This 21st day of December 2011, it appears to the Court that:

(1) The appellant, Chad Collins, filed a notice of appeal from the Family Court’s October 20, 2011 order issued after a preliminary protective hearing. On its face, the order did not finally determine and terminate the underlying dependency/neglect petition in the Family Court.

(2) Supreme Court Rule 42 (“Rule 42”) governs interlocutory appeals, *i.e.*, appeals from interim, non-final orders. Absent compliance

¹ By Order dated November 23, 2011, the Court *sua sponte* assigned a pseudonym to the appellant.

with Rule 42, this Court's jurisdiction is limited to the review of final judgments of trial courts.²

(3) On November 23, 2011, the Clerk issued a notice directing that Collins show cause why this appeal should not be dismissed as an unauthorized interlocutory appeal. In his answer to the notice to show cause, Collins addresses the merit of the underlying dependency/neglect petition. He does not, however, address that the appeal is from an interlocutory order and is not in compliance with Rule 42. The Court concludes that, in the absence of Collins' compliance with Rule 42, this appeal must be dismissed.³

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED, pursuant to Supreme Court Rules 29(c) and 42, that the appeal is DISMISSED.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Jack B. Jacobs
Justice

² *Julian v. State*, 440 A.2d 990, 991 (Del. 1982).

³ *Id.*