

JUSTICE OF THE PEACE COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE  
IN AND FOR SUSSEX COUNTY  
COURT NO. 17

SUN COMMUNITIES, INC. DBA SEA AIR VILLAGE	§	
Plaintiff Below,	§	
	§	
	§	
VS	§	C.A. No. JP17-26-001846
	§	
	§	
MICKEY WEICKSEL	§	
LORRAINE SHARRAR	§	
Defendant Below,		

TRIAL DE NOVO

Submitted: May 26, 2026

Decided: May 29, 2026

**APPEARANCES:**

Sun Communities, Inc., d/b/a Sea Air Village, Plaintiff Below/Appellee, represented by Nicole Faries,  
Esquire

Mickey Weicksel, Defendant Below/Appellant, appeared *pro se*

Lorraine Sharrar, Defendant Below/Appellant, appeared *pro se*

Alan G. Davis, Chief Magistrate

Jennifer Sammons, Deputy Chief Magistrate

William Wood, Justice of the Peace

**JUSTICE OF THE PEACE COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE  
IN AND FOR SUSSEX COUNTY  
COURT NO. 17**

**CIVIL ACTION NO: JP17-26-001846**

**SUN COMMUNITIES VS MICKEY WEICKSEL ET AL**

**ORDER ON TRIAL DE NOVO**

The Court has entered a judgment or order in the following form:

**BACKGROUND**

Plaintiff Below/Appellee Sun Communities, Inc., d/b/a Sea Air Village, seeks possession of its rental property, a mobile home lot located at 20029 Atlantic Avenue in Rehoboth Beach, Delaware. The complaint filed on March 10, 2026, is based on alleged rules violations of subletting without approval, which constitutes a violation of the lease agreement signed by Defendants Below/Appellants Mickey Weicksel and Lorraine Sharrar on July 8, 2022.

Following trial below held on May 4, 2026, the Court entered judgment for the Plaintiff awarding possession of the rental property and court costs. On May 12, 2026, Defendant Weicksel filed a timely appeal of the judgment pursuant to 25 *Del. C.* § 5717. This is the decision of the Three-Judge Panel hearing the appeal as a Trial *De Novo*.

**DISCUSSION**

Prior to trial, the Court addressed several motions filed on May 26, 2026, by Defendant Below/Appellant Weicksel. The Court previously denied a motion to dismiss on May 21, 2026. The Court informed Mr. Weicksel the purpose of the appeal process pursuant to statute allows him the opportunity for a new trial during which he can present testimony and evidence to support the issues raised in his motion. Despite this ruling, Mr. Weicksel filed additional motions to dismiss, along with other filings, prior to the trial *de novo* proceeding.

As such, the Court methodically reviewed each of the pending motion requests before the Court at the outset of the proceeding. Three requests sought clarification as to the legal status of Lorraine Sharrar in this matter. The Court ruled that Mr. Weicksel could not make an argument on behalf of Ms. Sharrar and that she would remain as a party on the complaint. The Court would determine at trial whether dismissal would be appropriate based upon the evidence presented. Three additional requests sought dismissal of the complaint prior to testimony for various reasons. The Court denied these requests as the trial *de novo* is a new trial during which the Court shall hear testimony and review exhibits to render final judgment. An additional request sought for the Court to exclude, delay, or limit testimony from certain witnesses. The Court received no proffer as to what the witnesses would provide thus would not rule to exclude. The Court advised Mr. Weicksel of his right to raise objections at the time of witness testimony upon which the Court would rule with context.

During the proceedings, while the Court addressed several motions, Defendant Below/Appellant Weicksel was disruptive and was warned on several occasions that he could be held in contempt of court

VIEW YOUR CASE ONLINE: <https://courtconnect.courts.delaware.gov>

or sanctioned under Justice of the Peace Court Civil Rule 11. Mr. Weicksel would not comply with court instructions, repeatedly questioned rulings from the Court and made obvious intentional efforts to derail and/or otherwise delay the proceedings. The Court took a recess to allow all parties to consider the ground rules outlined at the outset of the proceedings. Upon returning to the courtroom, Mr. Weicksel stated that he was feeling ill and may need to leave the proceedings. The Court allowed a recess for Mr. Weicksel to contact his medical doctor which he was unable to accomplish. Following such recess, Mr. Weicksel was admonished by the Court for the use of ChatGPT on his cell phone and/or laptop during the proceeding. Ultimately, the Court offered to call Mr. Weicksel an ambulance, but he left of his own volition. The Court denied a request for a continuance. Mr. Weicksel was advised that the trial would proceed in his absence.

Plaintiff Below/Appellee presented its case. By a preponderance of the evidence, the Court found, among other things, that Mr. Weicksel sublet his home to Elijah Pummer, who testified that he rented from Mr. Weicksel for \$900 per month from August 2024 through November 2025. Plaintiff Below/Appellee sent a notice of noncompliance with the rental agreement dated October 24, 2025, advising that the landlord was aware of unauthorized occupants living at the property and that they must be removed. The office coordinator, Ms. Stoll, testified that no corrective action was taken during the 12-day cure period allotted by statute.

Subsequently, Gregory Ahlquist testified that he rented from Mr. Weicksel from March through April of 2026 for \$700.00 per month. Plaintiff Below/Appellee notified Defendants Below/Appellants, by way of letter dated March 3, 2026, that the lease was terminated due to subleasing the property in violation of the lease agreement.

Defendant Below/Appellant Lorraine Sharrar testified that she never lived at the rental property, nor did her children, who were listed on the lease, and that she completed the application only to help Mr. Weicksel obtain approval from the community. Ms. Sharrar testified that she contacted the landlord and completed paperwork to be removed from the lease, although she never received confirmation of her removal. Plaintiff Below/Appellee requested to withdraw the action against Ms. Sharrar.

#### DECISION

Plaintiff Below/Appellee proved by a preponderance of the evidence, that Mr. Weicksel violated community rules, was warned that another violation would result in termination of the lease and was notified that the lease was terminated when he repeated the violation. All procedures were undertaken in accordance with 25 *Del. C.* §7016. Specifically, §7016 (b)(2) states, in pertinent part:

*(b) A landlord may terminate a rental agreement with a tenant by providing prior written notice as follows:*

*(2) If the noncompliance is based upon a condition on or of the premises, ... the landlord shall notify the tenant in writing, specifying the condition constituting the noncompliance and allowing the tenant 12 days from the date of mailing...to remedy the noncompliance. If the tenant remains in noncompliance at the expiration of the 12-day period, ... the landlord may immediately terminate the rental agreement and bring an action for summary possession.*

Accordingly, judgment is awarded to Plaintiff Below/Appellee Sun Communities, Inc., d/b/a Sea Air Village, and against Defendant Below/Appellant Mickey Weicksel for possession of 20029 Atlantic Avenue, Rehoboth Beach, DE, and court costs.

VIEW YOUR CASE ONLINE: <https://courtconnect.courts.delaware.gov>

Plaintiff Below/Appellee's request to remove Defendant Below/Appellant Lorraine Sharrar as a party in this complaint is hereby granted.

IT IS SO ORDERED 29th day of May, 2026

/s/William Wood  
Justice of the Peace  
For the Three-Judge Panel



Information on post-judgment procedures for default judgment on Trial De Novo is found in the attached sheet entitled Justice of the Peace Courts Civil Post-Judgment Procedures Three Judge Panel (J.P. Civ. Form No. 14A3J).

**JUSTICE OF THE PEACE COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE  
IN AND FOR SUSSEX COUNTY  
COURT NO. 17**

**COURT ADDRESS:  
23730 SHORTLY ROAD  
GEORGETOWN DE 19947**

**CIVIL ACTION NO:  
JP17-26-001846**

**SUN COMMUNITIES, INC. DBA SEA AIR VILLAGE, PLAINTIFF  
VS  
MICKEY WEICKSEL, LORRAINE SHARRAR, DEFENDANTS**

**Plaintiff Parties:**

ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF  
SYSTEM ID: 005164  
NICOLE M FARIES  
THE FARIES FIRM, INC.  
1601 MILLTOWN ROAD  
SUITE 9  
WILMINGTON, DE 19808

PLAINTIFF  
SYSTEM ID: @4301395  
SUN COMMUNITIES, INC. DBA SEA AIR  
VILLAGE  
27777 FRANKLIN ROAD, #200  
SOUTHFIELD, MI 48034

**Other Case Parties:**

**Defendant Parties:**

DEFENDANT  
SYSTEM ID: @4301396  
MICKEY WEICKSEL  
20029 ATLANTIC AVENUE  
REHOBOTH BEACH, DE 19971

DEFENDANT  
SYSTEM ID: @4301397  
LORRAINE SHARRAR  
20029 ATLANTIC AVENUE  
REHOBOTH BEACH, DE 19971

**JUSTICE OF THE PEACE COURT  
CIVIL POST- JUDGMENT PROCEDURES  
THREE JUDGE PANEL**

*[This information is not legal advice and not a substitute for seeking legal advice from an attorney. This information is not binding on the court if incorrect or misunderstood. It relates to frequently asked questions concerning post-judgment procedures but does not address all of the possible procedures and may not apply in your particular case. Forms for these procedures may be obtained from any Justice of the Peace Court civil location. All motions must include the name of the court, the names of the parties, the case number, the date the motion is filed with the Justice of the Peace Court and a title indicating the reason for the motion. Court costs or fees must accompany the motion, unless the person has requested, and the court determined, that the person may proceed in forma pauperis (without paying costs or fees or posting bond because they have no money to pay).]*

**All payments should be made directly to the prevailing party. The Court does not accept payment on judgments.**

**Pursuant to 10 Del. C. § 9567(b), prevailing parties are reminded of their duty to file a satisfaction of the judgment within 90 days of payment in full.**

**FAILURE OF A PARTY TO APPEAR FOR THE PANEL TRIAL**

As provided by Justice of the Peace Civil Rule 72.1(f), if the Appellant (the party who requested the appeal trial) or both parties fail to appear for the trial, the judgment of the court below shall stand unless the Appellee appears and has filed a counterclaim.

If the Appellee (the party against whom the appeal was taken) fails to appear and a DEFAULT JUDGMENT is entered, that party may file a Motion To Vacate the judgment pursuant to Justice of the Peace Civil Rule 60. The Motion must show; (1) the Appellee's failure to appear was the result of actions of a reasonably prudent person; and (2) the outcome would be different if the trial were held; and (3) the party that appeared would not be prejudiced by having the trial. The Motion must be filed within 10 days, starting the day after the judgment was signed by the De Novo Panel. **A FEE OF \$15.00 MUST ACCOMPANY THIS MOTION.**

**MOTION FOR A NEW TRIAL**

Either party has 10 days, starting the day after the judgment was signed by a Judge, to file a Motion For A New Trial as provided under Justice of the Peace Court Civil Rule 59. This Motion shall be in writing and shall briefly and succinctly state the reasons for the request. A Motion For A New Trial will be heard by the Panel of Judges who originally heard the case. The reasons for which a new trial may be granted are limited. For example, the reason given for requesting a new trial may be newly discovered evidence. However, for the Panel to grant a motion for a new trial based upon newly discovered evidence, the party requesting the new trial must show all of the following: (1) the newly discovered evidence is important enough to change the result in the case; (2) the evidence could not have been discovered prior to the original trial with reasonable investigation; and (3) the evidence does not merely repeat or dispute evidence presented in the original trial. **A FEE OF \$15.00 MUST ACCOMPANY THIS MOTION.**

VIEW YOUR CASE ONLINE: <https://courtconnect.courts.delaware.gov>