IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

IVAN MENDEZ,	§	
	§	
Defendant Below-Appellant,	§	No. 271, 2013
	§	
	§	
v.	§	Court Below—Superior Court
	§	of the State of Delaware,
STATE OF DELAWARE,	§	in and for Sussex County
	§	Cr. ID 0012015854
Plaintiff Below-Appellee.	§	
	§	

Submitted: June 17, 2013
Decided: June 24, 2013

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

O R D E R

This 24th day of June 2013, it appears to the Court that:

(1) On May 23, 2013, the Court received appellant's notice of appeal from the Superior Court's sentencing order dated June 15, 2001. The Clerk issued a notice pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 29(b) directing appellant to show cause why the appeal should not be dismissed as untimely filed.[1] The notice to show cause also indicated that the appellant had

[1]Del. Supr. Ct. R. 6(a)(ii).

previously filed a timely direct appeal in 2001, which resulted in this Court's decision in 2002 affirming his convictions and sentence.[2]

(2) Appellant filed a twenty-one page response to the notice to show cause on June 17, 2013. The response does not address either the issue of the untimeliness of his present notice of appeal or this Court's prior adjudication of his direct appeal in 2002.

(3) Under the circumstances, this Court has no jurisdiction to consider appellant's present appeal. Appellant's direct appeal was fully adjudicated by this Court in 2002. To the extent appellant now seeks to reargue the outcome of that appeal, his attempt is untimely.[3] Moreover, the Superior Court docket reflects no other recent ruling by that court from which appellant could now seek to appeal.

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

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Carolyn Berger
Justice

---

[2] *Mendez v. State*, 2002 WL 371862 (Del. Mar. 5, 2002).

[3] Del. Supr. Ct. R. 18 (2013) (a motion for reargument must be filed within 15 days of the Court's ruling).