

**COURT OF CHANCERY  
OF THE  
STATE OF DELAWARE**

SAM GLASSCOCK III  
VICE CHANCELLOR

COURT OF CHANCERY COURTHOUSE  
34 THE CIRCLE  
GEORGETOWN, DELAWARE 19947

January 31, 2013

Dean Campbell  
Law Office of Dean Campbell, LLC  
401 N. Bedford Street  
P.O. Box 568  
Georgetown, DE 19947

David J. Weidman  
Sergovic, Carmean & Weidman, P.A.  
142 E. Market Street  
P.O. Box 751  
Georgetown, DE 19947

Re: *David J. Branson, et al. v. Vincent Branson*  
Civil Action No. 7603-VCG

Dear Counsel:

I have before me Mr. Campbell's January 31, 2013 "Motion for an Enlargement of Time" to file a Motion for Reargument pursuant to Court of Chancery Rule 59(f). Rule 59(f) requires a Motion for Reargument to be filed within 5 days after a decision.<sup>1</sup> The stated rationale for Mr. Campbell's Motion for an Enlargement of Time is that he has been unable to file a Motion for Reargument because he has not yet received a transcript of the telephone conference held on January 24, 2013. A transcript is not required for counsel to file a Motion for Reargument. Therefore, the Motion for an Enlargement of Time is DENIED.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ct. Ch. R. 59(f) ("A motion for reargument setting forth briefly and distinctly the grounds therefor may be served and filed within 5 days after the filing of the Court's opinion or the receipt of the Court's decision.").

However, I will treat the Motion for an Enlargement of time as a Motion for Reargument on those issues raised in paragraph 4 of the Motion.<sup>2</sup> The parties should contact my chambers to schedule presentation of the Motion for Reargument. To the extent the foregoing requires an order to take effect, IT IS SO ORDERED.

Sincerely,

*/s/ Sam Glasscock III*

Sam Glasscock III

---

<sup>2</sup> Def.'s Mot. for Enlarg. of Time ¶ 4 ("The Motion for Reargument is being filed to take exception to your Honor's holding that this matter is an *in personam* action and not [sic] *in rem* action, and the general dismissal of the Interpleader. Defendant will present both case law, and support from *Pomeroy's Equity Jurisprudence* to demonstrate why these holdings are legally incorrect and actually act to take this matter outside the jurisdiction of the Court of Chancery.").