IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

| INDEPENDENCE MALL, INC., a | § |
|--|--------------------------------|
| Delaware corporation, | § |
| | § No. 70, 2013 |
| Plaintiff Below, | § |
| Appellant, | § |
| | § |
| V. | § |
| | § Court Below—Superior Court |
| MICHAEL J. WAHL, individually, | § of the State of Delaware, |
| and WAHL FAMILY DENTISTRY, | § in and for New Castle County |
| P.A., a Delaware corporation as | § |
| successor-in-interest to Dr. Mervin H. | § C.A. No. N10C-12-031 FSS |
| Wahl, P.A., | § |
| , | § |
| Defendants Below, | 8 |
| Appellees. | |
| 1 1 | |

Submitted: February 18, 2013 Decided: February 21, 2013

Before HOLLAND, JACOBS, and RIDGELY, Justices.

ORDER

This 21st day of February 2013, it appears to the Court that:

(1) The plaintiff-appellant, Independence Mall, Inc., has filed an interlocutory appeal, pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 42, from an interlocutory order of the Superior Court dated January 17, 2013. The Superior Court order denied plaintiff's motion to reargue, or alternatively to amend, a prior order of the Superior Court dated December 31, 2012 that denied plaintiff's motion for

summary judgment and granted, in part, defendant's motion for partial summary

judgment.

(2) The plaintiff filed its application for certification to take an

interlocutory appeal in the Superior Court on January 28, 2013. The Superior

Court denied the certification application on February 7, 2013.

(3) Applications for interlocutory review are addressed to the sound

discretion of this Court. In the exercise of its discretion, this Court has concluded

that the application for interlocutory appeal does not meet the requirements of

Supreme Court Rule 42(b) and should be refused.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the within interlocutory appeal

is hereby REFUSED.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Jack B. Jacobs

Justice

-2-