## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

| SUMMIT STEEL, INC.,          | §                              |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|
|                              | §                              |
| Third Party Defendant Below- | § No. 715, 2002                |
| Appellant,                   | §                              |
|                              | § Court Below—Superior Court   |
| V.                           | § of the State of Delaware,    |
|                              | § in and for New Castle County |
| EDIS COMPANY, EDIS BUILDING  | § C.A. No. 01C-09-183          |
| SYSTEMS, INC., ERNEST        | §                              |
| DISABATINO AND SONS, INC.,   | §                              |
| CONSTRUCTION SAFETY          | §                              |
| CONSULTANTS, INC., ATLAS     | §                              |
| LAB ASSOCIATES, ATLAS        | §                              |
| POINT, LLC, and CRYSTAL      | §                              |
| HOLDINGS, INC.,              | §                              |
|                              | §                              |
| Defendants/Third Party       | §                              |
| Plaintiffs Below-            | §                              |
| Appellees.                   | §                              |

Submitted: January 24, 2003 Decided: February 27, 2003

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

## ORDER

This 27<sup>th</sup> day of February 2003, it appears to the Court that:

(1) The third-party defendant below, Summit Steel, Inc., has petitioned this Court, pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 42, to appeal from an interlocutory ruling of the Superior Court entered November 25, 2002. The Superior Court's ruling denied Summit's second motion for summary judgment.

(2) On January 15, 2003, the Superior Court denied Summit's

application to certify an interlocutory appeal to this Court.

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

discretion of this Court and are granted only in extraordinary cases.

(4) In the exercise of its discretion, this Court has concluded that the

application for interlocutory review does not meet the requirements of Supreme

Court Rule 42(b) and should be refused.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the within

interlocutory appeal is REFUSED.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ E. Norman Veasey

Chief Justice

-2-