IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

JORDAN SLEVIN,	§	
	§	
Defendant Below,	§	No. 246, 2024
Appellant,	§	
	§	Court Below—Superior Court
v.	§	of the State of Delaware
	§	
STATE OF DELAWARE,	§	Cr. ID No. N2305016360A
	§	
Appellee.	§	

Submitted: November 27, 2024
Decided: January 23, 2025

Before **SEITZ,** Chief Justice; **LEGROW** and **GRIFFITHS**, Justices.

ORDER

After consideration of the brief and motion to withdraw filed by the appellant's counsel under Supreme Court Rule 26(c), the State's response, and the record on appeal, it appears to the Court that:

(1) A Superior Court jury found the appellant, Jordan Slevin, guilty of two counts of first-degree rape and several other sexual offenses against a young child. The Superior Court sentenced Slevin to a total of 104 years of imprisonment, suspended after 102 years for decreasing levels of supervision. This is Slevin's direct appeal.

(2) On appeal, Slevin's counsel has filed a brief and a motion to withdraw under Supreme Court Rule 26(c). Counsel asserts that, based upon a conscientious

review of the record and the law, the appeal is without merit. In his statement filed under Rule 26(c), counsel indicates that he provided Slevin with a copy of the motion to withdraw and the accompanying brief and informed Slevin of his right to submit any points that he wanted this Court to consider on appeal. Slevin has not submitted any points for the Court's consideration. The State has responded to the Rule 26(c) brief and argues that the Superior Court's judgment should be affirmed.

(3) When reviewing a motion to withdraw and an accompanying brief under Rule 26(c), this Court must be satisfied that the appellant's counsel has made a conscientious examination of the record and the law for arguable claims.[1] This Court must also conduct its own review of the record and determine whether "the appeal is indeed so frivolous that it may be decided without an adversary presentation."[2]

(4) The Court has reviewed the record carefully and concluded that the appeal is wholly without merit and devoid of any arguably appealable issue. We also are satisfied that counsel made a conscientious effort to examine the record and the law and properly determined that Slevin could not raise a meritorious claim on appeal.

[1] *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 82-83 (1988); *McCoy v. Court of Appeals of Wisconsin*, 486 U.S. 429, 442 (1988); *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744 (1967).
[2] *Penson*, 488 U.S. at 82.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the judgment of the Superior Court is AFFIRMED. The motion to withdraw is moot.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ N. Christopher Griffiths
Justice