## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

ONEIL A. ROSE, § § No. 147, 2016 Defendant Below-§ Appellant, § § Court Below—Superior Court v. of the State of Delaware STATE OF DELAWARE. § Cr. ID 1206001558 Plaintiff Below-§ Appellee. §

> Submitted: July 11, 2016 Decided: July 20, 2016

Before STRINE, Chief Justice; HOLLAND, and VALIHURA, Justices.

## ORDER

This 20<sup>th</sup> day of July 2016, it appears to the Court that:

- (1) On March 24, 2016, the Court received appellant Oneil Rose's notice of appeal from a Superior Court order dated January 28, 2016 (and docketed February 1, 2016). The Superior Court's order denied Rose's motion for postconviction relief. Under Supreme Court Rule 6(a)(iv), a timely notice of appeal should have been filed on or before March 2, 2016.
- (2) On June 30, 2016, the Senior Court Clerk issued a notice directing Rose to show cause why his appeal should not be dismissed as

untimely.<sup>1</sup> Rose filed a response on July 11, 2016. His response only

addresses the merits of his appeal and does not address the jurisdictional

defect created by his untimely filing.

(3) Time is a jurisdictional requirement.<sup>2</sup> A notice of appeal must

be received by the Office of the Clerk of this Court within the applicable time

period in order to be effective.<sup>3</sup> An appellant's pro se status does not excuse

a failure to comply strictly with the jurisdictional requirements of Supreme

Court Rule 6.4 This Court cannot consider an untimely appeal unless an

appellant can demonstrate that the failure to file a timely notice of appeal is

attributable to court-related personnel.<sup>5</sup> Rose has not made such a showing in

this case. Thus, the Court concludes that his appeal must be dismissed.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the appeal is

DISMISSED.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Randy J. Holland

**Justice** 

<sup>1</sup>Del. Supr. Ct. R. 6(a)(iv).

<sup>2</sup>Carr v. State, 554 A.2d 778, 779 (Del.), cert. denied, 493 U.S. 829 (1989).

<sup>3</sup>Del. Supr. Ct. R. 10(a).

<sup>4</sup>Smith v. State, 47 A.3d 481, 486-87 (Del. 2012).

<sup>5</sup>Bey v. State, 402 A.2d 362, 363 (Del. 1979).

-2-