

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

ROBERT P. REEDER,	§
	§ No. 147, 2006
Plaintiff Below-	§
Appellant,	§
	§
v.	§
	§
DELAWARE DEPARTMENT OF	§ Court Below—Court of Chancery
INSURANCE, DEFENSIVE	§ of the State of Delaware,
DRIVING CREDENTIAL	§ in and for New Castle County
COMMITTEE, and DEPARTMENT	§ C.A. No. 1553-N
OF JUSTICE,	§
	§
Defendants Below-	§
Appellees.	§

Submitted: July 28, 2006

Decided: October 2, 2006

Before **STEELE**, Chief Justice, **JACOBS**, and **RIDGELY**, Justices.

ORDER

This 2nd day of October 2006, upon consideration of the parties' briefs and the record below, it appears to the Court that:

(1) The appellant, Robert Reeder, filed this appeal from a decision of the Court of Chancery granting summary judgment to the Department of Insurance and the Defensive Driving Credential Committee on eight counts of Reeder's complaint and dismissing the complaint against the Department of Justice. The trial court granted summary judgment to Reeder on one

claim and ordered the correction of the minutes of the DDCC's February 11, 2005 meeting.

(2) Reeder raises five claims in his opening brief on appeal. First, he asserts that the trial judge abused his discretion by failing to recuse himself from Reeder's case. Second, Reeder contends that the trial court erred in holding that Reeder was aware of the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and thus was bound by FOIA's sixty-day limitations period. Third, Reeder asserts that the trial court erred in dismissing his claims against the Department of Justice, which were based on erroneous legal advice provided by the DOJ to the DDCC and resulted in alleged FOIA violations. Fourth, Reeder contends that the trial court erred in holding that many of Reeder's claims were moot given the abolition of the DDCC in February 2006. Finally, Reeder claims that the trial court erred in holding that the DDCC did not violate any of Reeder's rights by limiting his presentation to five minutes at the DDCC's July 12, 2005 meeting.

(3) After careful consideration of the parties' respective positions on appeal, we find it manifest that the judgment below should be affirmed on the basis of, and for the reasons set forth in, the Court of Chancery's well-reasoned, fifty-two page opinion. We find no error in the trial court's rulings of law and no abuse of the trial court's discretion.

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

BY THE COURT:

/s/Henry duPont Ridgely
Justice