

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

DOROTHY SMITH, ¹	§
	§ No. 56, 2026
Respondent Below,	§
Appellant,	§ Court Below—Family Court
	§ of the State of Delaware
v.	§
	§ File No. CN19-05220
TYLER RENCK,	§ Petition No. 25-21868
	§
Petitioner Below,	§
Appellee.	§

Submitted: February 25, 2026

Decided: March 30, 2026

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

ORDER

After consideration of the notice to show cause and the response, it appears to the Court that:

(1) On February 5, 2026, Dorothy Smith (“Mother”) filed this appeal from a Family Court order, dated and docketed on January 5, 2026, finding her in contempt of a custody order and a contempt order. A timely appeal of the order would have been filed by February 4, 2026. The Senior Court Clerk issued a notice directing Mother to show cause why the appeal should not be dismissed as untimely.

¹ The Court previously assigned pseudonyms to the parties under Supreme Court Rule 7(d).

In her response, Mother stated that she inadvertently miscalculated the appeal deadline and asked the Court to permit the appeal to proceed in the interest of justice.

(2) Time is a jurisdictional requirement.² A notice of appeal must be received by the Office of the Clerk of this Court within the applicable time period to be effective.³ An appellant's pro se status does not excuse a failure to comply with the jurisdictional requirements of Supreme Court Rule 6.⁴ Unless an appellant can demonstrate that the failure to file a timely notice of appeal is attributable to court-related personnel, an untimely appeal cannot be considered.⁵

(3) Mother has not shown that her failure to file a timely appeal is attributable to court-related personnel. She admits that she miscalculated the appeal deadline. Consequently, this case does not fall within the exception to the general rule that mandates the timely filing of a notice of appeal.⁶

² *Carr v. State*, 554 A.2d 778, 779 (Del. 1989).

³ Del. Supr. Ct. R. 10(a).

⁴ *Carr*, 554 A.2d at 779.

⁵ *Bey v. State*, 402 A.2d 362, 363 (Del. 1979).

⁶ See, e.g., *Yothers v. Yothers*, 203 A.3d 319, 2018 WL 6721220, at *1 (Del. Dec. 20, 2018) (TABLE) (dismissing untimely appeal where appellant's counsel admitted that he miscalculated the filing deadline); *Beeghley v. Beeghley*, 698 A.2d 409, 1997 WL 450254, at *1 (Del. July 30, 1997) (TABLE) (dismissing untimely appeal where appellant admitted that she miscalculated the filing deadline).

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED, under Supreme Court Rules 29(b),
that this appeal is DISMISSED.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ N. Christopher Griffiths
Justice