

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

|                    |                                |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|
| REBECCA RAHMAN,    | §                              |
|                    | § Nos. 118/119, 2014           |
| Defendant Below,   | §                              |
| Appellant,         | § Court Below—Superior Court   |
|                    | § of the State of Delaware,    |
| v.                 | § in and for New Castle County |
|                    | §                              |
| STATE OF DELAWARE, | § Cr. ID Nos. 1201012281       |
|                    | § and 1211018185               |
| Plaintiff Below,   | §                              |
| Appellee.          | §                              |

Submitted: March 18, 2014

Decided: March 21, 2014

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

**ORDER**

This 21st day of March 2014, it appears to the Court that:

(1) On March 6, 2014, the Court received appellant’s notices of appeal from two orders of the Superior Court dated January 9, 2014 and January 27, 2014, which denied her motions seeking credit for time served. It appears from the Superior Court docket in Cr. ID 1211018185 that appellant filed four successive motions seeking credit for time served in October 2013, November 2013, December 2013, and January 2014, all of which were denied. Appellant did not appeal the first two denials but has now appealed the latter two orders.

(2) The Clerk issued notices pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 29(b) directing appellant to show cause why her appeals should not be dismissed for her failure to file them within 30 days of the Superior Court's orders.<sup>1</sup> Appellant filed a single response to the notices to show cause on March 18, 2014. She asserts that she did not know that she only had 30 days to file a timely appeal.

(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.<sup>4</sup> Unless the appellant can demonstrate that the failure to file a timely notice of appeal is attributable to court-related personnel, her appeal cannot be considered.<sup>5</sup> These cases do not fall within the exception to the general rule that mandates the timely filing of a notice of appeal. Thus, the Court concludes that the within appeals must be dismissed.

---

<sup>1</sup> DEL. SUPR. CT. R. 6(a)(iii) (2014).

<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).

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED, pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 29(b), that the within appeals are DISMISSED.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Jack B. Jacobs  
Justice