

**IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE  
IN AND FOR NEW CASTLE COUNTY**

|                    |   |                        |
|--------------------|---|------------------------|
| STATE OF DELAWARE, | ) |                        |
|                    | ) |                        |
| Plaintiff,         | ) |                        |
| v.                 | ) |                        |
|                    | ) |                        |
| NATHAN R. BOYKIN,  | ) | Cr. ID. No. 1106017020 |
|                    | ) |                        |
| Defendant.         | ) |                        |
|                    | ) |                        |

Submitted: January 21, 2014  
Decided: March 10, 2014

Upon Commissioner’s Report and Recommendation that Defendant’s Motion for Postconviction Relief Should be Denied and Counsel’s Motion to Withdraw Should be Granted.

**ADOPTED**

**ORDER**

This 10th day of March, 2014, the Court has considered the Commissioner’s Report and Recommendation, the Defendant’s Motion for Postconviction Relief, Mr. Zemble’s Motion to Withdraw as Counsel, the Plea Transcript, and the Affidavit of Trial Attorney Kester I.H. Crosse, Esquire.

On April 8, 2013, Defendant Nathan R. Boykin filed a *pro se* motion for postconviction relief. Subsequently, Defendant was assigned counsel. Assigned counsel then filed a Motion to Withdraw as Postconviction Counsel pursuant to

Superior Court Criminal Rule 61(e)(2). The motions were referred to a Superior Court Commissioner in accordance with 10 *Del. C.* § 512(b) and Superior Court Criminal Rule 62 for proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law. The Commissioner issued the Report and Recommendation on January 6, 2014. The Commissioner recommended that Defendant's Motion for Postconviction Relief be denied, and that Counsel's Motion to Withdraw should be granted. "Within ten days after filing of a Commissioner's proposed findings of fact and recommendations . . . any party may serve and file written objections."<sup>1</sup> Neither party has filed an objection to the Commissioner's Report and Recommendation.

The Court holds that the Commissioner's Report and Recommendation dated January 6, 2014, should be adopted for the reasons set forth therein. The Commissioner's findings are not clearly erroneous, are not contrary to law, and are not an abuse of discretion.<sup>2</sup>

**THEREFORE**, the Court hereby accepts the Commissioner's Report and Recommendation in its entirety.

**IT IS SO ORDERED**

/s/ Mary M. Johnston

The Honorable Mary M. Johnston

---

<sup>1</sup> Super. Ct. Crim. R. 62(a)(5)(ii).

<sup>2</sup> Super. Ct. Crim. R. 62(a)(4)(iv).