IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

DEBRA BENNETT and WILLIAM § BENNETT, No. 110, 2014 Plaintiffs Below-§ § § Appellants, Court Below—Superior Court v. of the State of Delaware, § in and for Sussex County USAA CASUALTY INSURANCE § C.A. No. S10C-02-010 COMPANY, § § Defendant Below-Ş Appellee.

> Submitted: March 3, 2014 Decided: March 6, 2014

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

ORDER

This 6^{th} day of March 2014, it appears to the Court that:

(1) The plaintiffs-appellants, Debra and William Bennett, have petitioned this Court, pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 42, to accept an appeal from an interlocutory order of the Superior Court dated December 13, 2013. The trial court's order denied defendant USAA's motion for partial summary judgment. In denying USAA's motion, the Superior Court noted that the Bennetts did not contest USAA's interpretation of the policy provisions, including the policy limits. The Bennetts sought reargument, contending that the Superior Court's decision

effectively eliminated their claim for consequential damages. The Superior Court

denied reargument on February 5, 2014.

(2) The Bennetts filed their application for certification to take an

interlocutory appeal in the Superior Court on February 14, 2014. The Superior

Court denied the certification application on February 26, 2014, noting that the

Bennetts misinterpreted the trial court's denial of USAA's motion for partial

summary judgment as a complete denial of their claim for consequential damages.

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

discretion of this Court. 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/ Carolyn Berger

Justice

-2-