

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

LACHHMAN DASS GUPTA and	§
MANJULA GUPTA,	§
	§ No. 364, 2025
Defendants Below,	§
Appellants,	§ Court Below—Superior Court
	§ of the State of Delaware
v.	§
	§ C.A. No. SK02J-05-068
CITIZENS BANK, Successor to	§
MELLON BANK (DE) NATIONAL	§
ASSOCIATION,	§
	§
Plaintiff Below,	§
Appellee.	§

Submitted: March 13, 2026

Decided: May 11, 2026

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

ORDER

Upon consideration of the parties’ briefs, the record on appeal, and the appellants’ motion, it appears to the Court that:

(1) The appellants, Lachhman Dass Gupta and Manjula Gupta, filed this appeal from a Superior Court order denying their motion to set aside the judgment. The Guptas have also filed a motion for sanctions (“the Motion”). As set forth below, we deny the Motion and affirm the Superior Court’s judgment.

(2) In 2002, Citizens Bank, as successor to Mellon Bank (DE) National Association, sought entry of judgment against the Guptas as personal guarantors of a

loan to Gupta Associates, Inc. This Court affirmed the Superior Court's entry of judgment against the Guptas.¹

(3) In 2017, the Guptas moved to set aside the judgment, alleging fraud under Superior Court Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b). The Superior Court determined that the Guptas were not entitled to relief, and this Court affirmed the Superior Court's decision.² In 2024, the Guptas again sought to reopen the judgment on the basis of fraud. The Superior Court denied the motion, finding that they did not establish a basis for relief under Rule 60(b). The Guptas filed an untimely appeal, which this Court dismissed in June 2025.³

(4) In August 2025, the Guptas again sought to reopen the judgment on the basis of fraud. The Superior Court denied the motion. This appeal followed.

(5) In their briefs and the Motion, the Guptas make the same claims of fraud that they have unsuccessfully raised before. They identify no basis for reversal of the Superior Court's judgment or an award of sanctions. If the Guptas file another appeal from the Superior Court's denial of a repetitive motion in this matter, the Clerk's Office shall issue a notice directing the Guptas to show cause why their appeal should not be dismissed as frivolous and repetitive.

¹ *Gupta v. Citizens Bank*, 860 A.2d 810, 2004 WL 1058409 (Del. May 4, 2004) (Table) (reargument denied after remand Sept. 28, 2024).

² *Gupta v. Citizens Bank*, 198 A.3d 721, 2018 WL 3202957 (Del. June 28, 2018) (Table).

³ *Gupta v. Citizens Bank*, 341 A.3d 1005, 2025 WL 1576762 (Del. June, 2025) (Table).

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the Motion is DENIED and the judgment of the Superior Court is AFFIRMED.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Collins J. Seitz, Jr.
Chief Justice