IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

LUIS G. CABRERA, JR.,	§	
	§	No. 82, 2018
Defendant Below,	§	
Appellant,	§	Court Below: Superior Court
	§	of the State of Delaware
v.	§	
	§	ID. No. 9904019326
STATE OF DELAWARE,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff Below,	§	
Appellee.	§	

Submitted: September 26, 2018 Decided: October 4, 2018

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

ORDER

On this 4th day of October 2018, upon consideration of the parties' briefs and the record on appeal, it appears to the Court that:

(1) Appellant, Luis G. Cabrera, Jr., appeals from a Superior Court order denying Cabrera's Motion to Impose a Sentence Pursuant to the Class A Felony Statute. Cabrera makes two claims on appeal. First, he contends that this Court's decisions in *Rauf v. State*¹ and *Powell v. State*² invalidated the entirety of 11 *Del. C.* § 4209 (the first-degree murder sentencing statute), including the portion that

-

¹ 145 A.3d 430 (Del. 2016).

² 153 A.3d 69 (Del. 2016) (PER CURIAM).

imposes a mandatory sentence of life without parole for first-degree murder, thus requiring him to be sentenced under 11 *Del. C.* § 4205, the class A felony statute. Second, he contends that sentencing him to life without parole violates his constitutional rights, including his Eighth Amendment and due process rights.

- (2) Cabrera's claims are identical to those raised by the appellant in *Zebroski v. State*.³ In *Zebroski*, this Court affirmed the Superior Court's denial of *Zebroski's* claims that (1) *Rauf* invalidated not just Delaware's capital sentencing scheme, but all of 11 *Del. C.* § 4209 and (2) imposing a mandatory sentence of life without parole violates his Eighth Amendment and due process rights.⁴ This Court held that a "defendant whose sentence is vacated under *Rauf* and *Powell* must be resentenced to the punishment the General Assembly has specified as the alternative to death: life without parole." This Court further held that the imposition of a mandatory life sentence without parole does not violate the Eighth Amendment or due process rights.⁶
- (3) Because *Zebroski* addressed and denied each of the claims Cabrera now raises, the Superior Court did not err in denying Cabrera's Motion.

³ 179 A.3d at 857.

⁴ *Id.* at 857, 864.

⁵ *Id.* at 860.

⁶ *Id.* at 860-63.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the judgment of the Superior Court is **AFFIRMED.**

BY THE COURT:

/s/ James T. Vaughn, Jr. Justice