



THE FAMILY COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE  
IN AN FOR NEW CASTLE COUNTY

S----- R-----, ) File No.: CN25-01007  
Petitioner, ) Pet. No.: 26-12060  
)  
)  
v. )  
)  
)  
T---- B-----, )  
Respondent. )  
)  
)

**In the Interests of:**

A---- B----- (D.O.B. --/--/2020)

F---- B----- (D.O.B. --/--/2022)

---

**EMERGENCY VISITATION MODIFICATION ORDER**

Before the Court is an emergency petition to modify visitation, filed by S----- R----- - (“Mother”), represented by Susan Over, Esq., against T---- B----- (“Father”), represented by Keith Horner, Esq., and concerning A---- B----- (D.O.B. --/--/2020) (“A----”) and F---- B----- (D.O.B. --/--/2022) (“F----”) (collectively, the “children”). Until further investigation and psychosexual evaluation can be completed, Mother asks the Court to end Father’s unsupervised visitation, which began on May 2, 2026. For the reasons that follow, the Court **DENIES** Mother’s request for emergency modification and **GRANTS** Father’s request for attorney’s fees.

### **Procedural History and Factual Background**

The Court has recounted the protracted history of this case in three recent orders on custody and visitation.<sup>1</sup> For the sake of judicial economy, this order recites only the elements needed to understand the issues now presented.

Mother has suspected Father of sexually abusing the children since 2021, when A---- was one year old, and F---- was not yet born. By 2023, she had started routinely (and discreetly) recording her interactions with Father and with the children, hoping to gather evidence so that she could eventually prove the truth of her suspicions. She often recorded herself asking the children probing questions about their interactions with Father. On December 31, 2024, after a recorded conversation in which A---- made statements that Mother interpreted as disclosures of sexual abuse, Mother took the children to Nemours. In the months that followed, Father was investigated by the Division of Family Services (“DFS”), the police, and his employer—the Delaware National Guard. None of the three produced a finding that Father had sexually abused either of the children. DFS, in fact, found that the case “wasn’t close” in part because Mother’s recordings revealed that her questions were leading the children to give the answers she wanted.<sup>2</sup>

This Court reviewed many of those recordings before issuing its interim and final custody orders in the case. In the interim order, issued on August 19, 2025, the Court found that Father’s inconsistent answers in some recorded conversations with Mother were sufficiently concerning to warrant continued supervision while with the children.<sup>3</sup> The Court adhered to that position in a Reargument Order issued on October 3, 2025. But after a three-day custody hearing in December 2025 and January 2026, the Court found by a preponderance of the evidence that Father had not sexually abused the

---

<sup>1</sup> See *T.B. v. S.R.*, No. CN25-01007, 2025 WL 2945547, at \*1–4 (Del. Fam. Ct. Aug. 19, 2025) (interim custody order); *T.B. v. S.R.*, No.: CN25-01007, 2025 WL 2945818, at \*1–3 (Del. Fam. Ct. Oct. 3, 2025) (reargument order); *T.B. v. S.R.*, \_\_\_ A.3d \_\_\_, 2026 WL 446570, at \*1–2 (Del. Fam. Ct. Feb. 4, 2026).

<sup>2</sup> The Court takes judicial notice of the factfinding in its previous orders in this case. See D.R.E. 202.

<sup>3</sup> *T.B.*, 2025 WL 2945547 at \*11; see also *id.* at \*13 (“[B]ecause the Interim Custody Hearing raises more questions than answers, the Court finds that [supervision] is appropriate because it protects the children from danger to their physical health and does not impair their emotional development.”).

children.<sup>4</sup> Consequently, the Court ordered a gradual transition to unsupervised parenting time, which began on May 2, 2026.<sup>5</sup>

On May 12, 2026, however, Mother filed a Petition Rule to Show Cause, asking the Court to find Father in contempt of a non-disparagement clause in the custody order and suspend his right to visitation.<sup>6</sup> That petition remains pending. On June 5, 2026, Mother filed the present Petition for Modification of Visitation, along with her Motion and Affidavit for Emergency *Ex Parte* Relief filed by a different attorney from the other pending matter.<sup>7</sup> The Court denied Mother's request for *ex parte* relief, finding insufficient allegations of immediate or irreparable harm, but scheduled an in-person emergency hearing for June 18, 2026.<sup>8</sup> Mother and Father testified at the hearing, and Father stipulated to the admissibility of Mother's exhibits for the purposes of the emergency hearing only.

### **Summary of Trial Testimony**

#### *Mother's Testimony*

According to Mother, she filed her petition and emergency motion because the children have been "deteriorating before [her] eyes."<sup>9</sup> As Father's time has increased and become unsupervised, the children have had escalating behavioral issues—particularly after spending time with him. Neither child properly listens to Mother, and both tend to defend Father against her. A---- has developed an eating disorder and has been consistently acting out at school, including by undressing herself in class, which has led her to become socially isolated. Although she is potty trained, A---- has also spontaneously begun struggling with urinary incontinence. Similarly, F----'s behavior has

---

<sup>4</sup> See *T.B.*, 2026 WL 446570 at \*20.

<sup>5</sup> See *id.* at \*27–28.

<sup>6</sup> File CN25-01007, Pet. No. 26-09891, Tab 116.

<sup>7</sup> File CN25-01007, Pet. No. 26-12060, Tabs 120 and 123. Mother's motion was accompanied by 31 exhibits confusingly labeled A through Z. The exhibits included one un-numbered exhibit, no exhibit Y, and several exhibits sharing single letters.

<sup>8</sup> File CN25-01007, Pet. No. 26-12060, Tab 124; see 13 *Del. C.* § 723(a); *Del. Fam. Ct. Civ. R.* 65.2(a).

<sup>9</sup> Emergency Visitation Modification Hearing at 12:33:14–12:33:17 p.m., June 18, 2026 (audio).

been increasingly problematic. On one occasion, after Father introduced the children to a new partner on a trip to the zoo, F---- went on a “rampag[e]” in Mother’s home.<sup>10</sup>

More concerningly, Mother testified that she has seen A---- (who just turned six) and F---- (who is almost four) “acting out pornography,” “excessively masturbating,” and “act[ing] out sexually with each other in the most explicit manners.”<sup>11</sup> Once, after Mother found A---- masturbating in her sleep, A---- explained that she was dreaming about someone Mother described as “a transsexual porn star who dresses up really cartoonish.”<sup>12</sup> Mother has stopped bathing the children together, as they would engage in oral sex if her attention ever wandered. During one therapy session, F---- “grab[bed] A----’s crotch in an aggressive way” in front of the therapist.<sup>13</sup> Video calls with Father have also been a concern. Mother has seen the children undressing, licking the phone screen while naked, masturbating, dancing seductively, and engaging in sexual acts with each other. Mother worried that the children might be engaging in more sexual acts with each other while her back was turned, so she purchased a hidden camera and placed it in their room. Now, however, she simply tries to avoid leaving them alone together.

To address her fears and protect the children, Mother requests that Father’s unsupervised visitation be suspended until experts can further evaluate him and the children. First, she wants Dr. Gould to conduct an updated psychosexual examination of Father. Second, although Mother previously withdrew the children from care at Survivors of Abuse in Recovery in favor of general therapy with Kimberly Boulden of the Center for Child Development, she now wants them evaluated by psychological specialists in Philadelphia. In the meantime, Mother asks for Father to be limited to parenting time at the Family Visitation Center, as she believes that P---- B----- (“Paternal Grandmother”) enables Father’s worst behaviors and cannot be trusted to intervene even if she sees him sexually abusing A---- and F----.

---

<sup>10</sup> *Id.* at 1:03:03–1:03:10 p.m.

<sup>11</sup> *Id.* at 12:34:00–12:34:13 p.m.

<sup>12</sup> *Id.* at 1:07:20–1:07:40 p.m.

<sup>13</sup> *Id.* at 12:47:43–12:47:52 p.m.

On cross-examination, Mother conceded that she has never meaningfully shared any of her concerns with Father. She has mentioned the children’s behavioral difficulties, and she believes Father is aware of the children’s sexual acts, but she is hesitant to make accusations that might jeopardize her own safety. Mother’s therapist recently informed her that domestic violence in her relationship with Father now presents lethal risk. Lastly, though Mother testified that she cannot afford a co-parent coordinator and that a coordinator in any event could not prevent Father from sexually abusing the children, she sees litigation to prevent Father from having unsupervised contact with the children as a worthy investment.

### *Father’s Testimony*

Father testified that he has witnessed none of the problematic behaviors that Mother described. He has not seen the children act out sexually—during video calls or at his house. He has not struggled to manage the children’s emotions, and A---- has not wet the bed at his house. He noted that the “partner” to whom he introduced the children at the zoo was in fact the children’s paternal aunt, T----- B-----, who has been in their lives for years. On the whole, he feels that his time with the children has gone very well, and he worries that moving to supervised visitation at the Family Visitation Center “would break their heart[s].”<sup>14</sup> He knows that A---- has had some issues at school, but Mother has never shared any details with him. He supports maintaining or expanding his current visitation schedule, and he seeks an award of the attorney’s fees he incurred in defending this action.

### **Mother’s Exhibits**

After the hearing, the Court reviewed Mother’s 31 exhibits, which are listed below with their unaltered file names and labels. A summary of the exhibits follows:<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> *Id.* at 1:32:13–1:32:15 p.m.

<sup>15</sup> Father stipulated to the exhibits’ admissibility for the purpose of expediting the emergency hearing, but he reserved the right to challenge their admissibility or cross-examine Mother about them at any final hearing on this petition.

- **Exhibit A (titled “A----’s Sexualized Behavior”)**: An 18-minute video from Mother’s hidden camera between 4:45 p.m. and 5:03 p.m. on February 16, 2026 (a Monday), and the video captures the children playing in a bed without adult supervision. A---- is not wearing a shirt, but there is no overtly sexual or otherwise inappropriate behavior. At one point, A---- puts a glasses case near her crotch, but the Court does not find that overtly sexual. The Court also notes that, at this time, the children had not yet begun spending unsupervised time with Father.
- **Exhibit A1 (titled “A----’s Work”)**: An undated scan that appears to be schoolwork in which A---- wrote a handful of letters and numbers backward.
- **Exhibit A2 (titled “Sexualized behavior, foot fetish, taking offclothes ”)**: An undated recording of a video call with Father on the Talking Parents parenting app. The children engage in a tea party, never taking off any clothes (other than a costume skirt). At various times, the children move their feet or butts in front of the camera, to which Father responds by playfully complaining or pretending to be a monster that will eat anything placed in front of the camera.
- **Exhibit B (titled “A----’s angry drawing of Daddy”)**: An undated, unlabeled stick-figure drawing in what appears to be a science workbook. Without further context, the picture is not helpful to the Court.
- **Exhibit C (titled “A----’s Weight Chart, Dark Undereye Circles and Excema-compressed”)**: A weight chart appearing to show that, as of December 2025 (before Father had any unsupervised contact with her and at a time when, as now, Mother had almost complete control of A----’s diet and physical activity), A---- had gained significant weight in approximately a year and was in the 99<sup>th</sup> percentile for her age. The other pictures appear to show scratches and circles on A----’s face, but they are of little use to the Court without context.
- **Exhibits D1 and D2 (both titled “F---- Nail Picking”)**: Two short videos showing F---- picking her nails and Mother attempting to stop her. Without further context, the videos are not helpful to the Court.

- **Exhibits E1 and F (both titled “Nurse Slip – A---- stomachache”):** Nurse slips reporting that A---- experienced stomachaches at school on February 4 and 20, 2026.
- **Exhibit G (titled “March 15- pick up from overnight calling Stupid names dumb, screaming”):** A lengthy audio recording, apparently recorded in large part in Paternal Grandmother’s garage as Mother attempted to get the children buckled and ready to go after an exchange. The children are upset and repeatedly fight each other, and Mother struggles to calm them down. At one point, A---- calls F---- “stupid” and “dumb,” and Mother asks where she learned those words. Later, A---- apologizes and remarks that she has noticed she often becomes mean and angry at night.
- **Exhibits H, I, J, K, L, M, N, O, P, Q, R, and S (all titled “A----’s day”):** Brief reports from A----’s teachers from March 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, and 31, and April 13. On some days, A---- does well at school. On others, she does not. None of them report that A---- has displayed sexualized behavior or undressed herself in front of her class. A number of days are omitted, making these reports largely unhelpful as a way of measuring A----’s mood after exchanges.
- **Exhibit T (titled “April 26 overnight pickup at 507 pm overnight visit aggression feeling dizzy hitting screaming”):** An approximately 30-minute audio recording of another post-exchange pickup by Mother. The girls cry, scream, and fight in the back seat as Mother attempts to drive them home. Apparently, they are sad about pizza they had to leave behind. Neither A---- nor F---- says anything remotely indicative of abuse.
- **Exhibit T2 (titled “April 26-F---- aggressive destruction dysreg”):** A picture of F---- sitting on a bed next to a knocked-over lamp and something shattered on the ground.
- **Exhibit U (titled “April 27 2026 F---- violence after nightly call”):** A short video showing F---- throwing small objects on the floor and striking Mother as Mother attempts to put her to bed. F---- appears tired.

- **Exhibit V (titled “May 1 F---- Hitting Dysregulated”)**: A video taken by Mother in the car as F---- attacks her and pulls her hair. After a few moments, Mother successfully calms F---- down and returns her to her seat. The video also captures A---- singing to the camera, dancing, and smiling.
- **Exhibit W (titled “May 11 2026-Sexualized Behaviors-A---- trying to Lick F----'s Privates and saying 'I already licked you'”)**: A roughly two-minute video from Mother’s hidden camera, recording the children as they play unsupervised on a bed between 9:26 and 9:28 p.m. on May 11, 2026 (a Monday night). Neither A---- nor F---- is wearing a shirt, although Mother indicates A---- attempted to perform oral sex on F----, their playing and wrestling on the bed does not appear to be remotely sexual in nature.
- **Exhibit X (titled “May 14 2026-Sexualized Behaviors A---- and F---- twerking”)**: A video call with Father as Mother holds the phone for the children to speak with him. At one point, A---- and F---- shake their butts at the camera. Both are clothed. Father playfully expresses annoyance. Mother does not intervene.
- **Exhibit Z (titled “May 26 nightly call girls greet Father by licking phone”)**: Another video call with Father as Mother holds the phone for the video call, this time in the car. A---- and F---- playfully lick the phone screen. Father acts disgusted and tells them to stop. Mother concurs. F---- tells him the screen is “yummy.” Father eventually redirects by asking questions about the children’s experience at school that day.
- **Unlabeled Exhibit (titled “A----s Weight Oct 2025 to May 2026”)**: A weight chart indicating that A---- gained weight rapidly between October and December 2025, then at a slower rate between December 2025 and May 2026. The Court notes that Father’s visitation only began to increase and become unsupervised during the latter period.

### **Discussion**

When a party seeks modification of a prior visitation order, the Court's ultimate decision rests on an assessment of the children's best interests, including eight factors specified by statute.<sup>16</sup> The Court's findings regarding the factors carry great weight, and some factors may be given more weight than others.<sup>17</sup>

The Court may issue an emergency order without notice to the other party only on a clear, specific showing that the children will otherwise suffer "immediate and irreparable harm."<sup>18</sup> The Court may alternatively, as it did here, deny *ex parte* relief and schedule the matter for an expedited evidentiary hearing. At such a hearing, "the focus . . . is squarely on [preserving and protecting] the stability and best interests of the children" until a final trial can be held.<sup>19</sup> The Court grants relief where the party seeking it shows a reasonable probability that irreparable harm will befall the children before a final trial can be held, outweighing any harm likely to be inflicted on the other parent.<sup>20</sup>

Mother has alleged an irreparable harm, but she has not sufficiently proved one or shown that it is immediate. She seeks modification on the theory that Father is sexually abusing the children. At trial, she offered lurid descriptions of the children's sexual behavior with Father and each other. She detailed a pattern of sexual and behavioral dysregulation, at home and at school, following each visit with Father. But the evidence does not support her claims of irreparable harm. Instead, some of her videos, audio recordings, and other documents show young children becoming upset and acting out when tired or for other reasons. In other videos, the children are interacting in a healthy, appropriately playful manner with each other or with one or both parents. Some are simply unhelpful. Many of them date to before Father's unsupervised parenting began, making them largely irrelevant to claims of later sexual abuse. Despite

---

<sup>16</sup> 13 *Del. C.* §§ 729(a), 722. The Court must, however, "permit and encourage the child to have frequent and meaningful contact with both parents" unless contact with one parent "would endanger the child's physical health or significantly impair the child's emotional development." 13 *Del. C.* § 728(a).

<sup>17</sup> *Fisher v. Fisher*, 691 A.2d 619, 623 (Del. 1997).

<sup>18</sup> Del. Fam. Ct. Cir. R. 65.2(a); *see also* 13 *Del. C.* § 723(a).

<sup>19</sup> *T.B. v. S.R.*, No.: CN25-01007, 2025 WL 2945818, at \*5 (Del. Fam. Ct. Oct. 3, 2025) (citing *Choplosky v. Choplosky*, 584 A.2d 340, 343 (Pa. Super. Ct. 1990); *C.H.L. v. W.D.L.*, 214 A.3d 1272, 1283 (Pa. Super. Ct. 2019)).

<sup>20</sup> *Cf. Sunder Energy, LLC v. Jackson*, 332 A.3d 472, 494 (Del. 2024).

the suggestive names attached to the files, *none* capture any of the explicit sexual behavior that Mother described.

Even without documentary proof, Mother's testimony remains an important source of evidence. Yet it is hard to ignore the absence of such proof when a parent has placed a hidden camera in her children's room and routinely used her phone to take additional videos. It is even harder when her testimony about the content of those videos is contradicted by the videos themselves. None of the video calls submitted by Mother showed the children naked or acting in an identifiably sexual way. Rather, the hidden camera footage reveals the children playing together—sometimes in their underwear—while left unsupervised in Mother's home for long periods of time, relatively late on weeknights. The documents from A----'s school do not reference any incident where she removed her clothes in front of the class, and it appears that on many days she behaved herself and performed well at school—if not the whole school day, then at least for the majority of it. To the extent there is any pattern to her misbehavior and visits to the nurse, the exhibits are not helpful in identifying it, both because of the small size of the sample provided to the Court and because the entirety of that sample was before Father began having unsupervised time with the children.

Even those exhibits that are arguably concerning are not suggestive of abuse. A--- has gained some weight, but she is a growing child, and Mother's exhibits reveal only her weight, not her height or body mass index. In the videos provided to the Court, A---- does not appear to be significantly overweight. To the extent Mother has a concern over A----'s weight, she has been the primary caregiver in control over A----'s diet, physical activity, and sleep schedule. Although the children have experienced some minor health issues, and F---- has apparently developed the bad habit of picking her nails, neither is especially surprising nor concerning given the major life changes both have experienced this past year. Finally, while the children have sometimes become loudly upset or even violent after exchanges in the car, it is not surprising that young children will struggle to process their parents' divorce. As the Court observed in its Final Custody Order, the children's intermittent problematic behavior "seem[s] to reflect little more than

the ordinary anguish of children whose world has been torn asunder without explanation.”<sup>21</sup>

Consequently, the Court finds that Mother has not shown a reasonable likelihood of irreparable harm to the children warranting emergency modification. Consistent with the prior order, “[d]espite purchasing several sets of cameras, closely supervising Father, and repeatedly recording her children, Mother [has] never found the unambiguous evidence of abuse she was looking for. The children love Father and appear to be utterly at ease in his presence.”<sup>22</sup> None of this has changed in the intervening months. On the whole, A---- and F---- appear to be bright, happy, and playful children, but they are navigating a profoundly delicate and upsetting transition—one of the most challenging that a young child will ever experience.

Unfortunately, it appears that Mother’s protective instincts have clouded her judgment regarding what appear to be developmentally appropriate interactions between her children. Based on the evidence and testimony presented, Mother appears to have seriously misperceived or mischaracterized the videos captured on her cameras. If Mother has indeed seen her young children masturbating and performing oral sex on each other, there is no evidence to support her contention. The Court’s previous order for the parties to use a parenting coordinator “to the extent available” remains in effect, notwithstanding Mother’s belief that a coordinator will not help her protect the children. If either parent proves unable to facilitate the beneficial involvement of the other in the children’s lives, changes to the existing custody and residential arrangements may ultimately prove necessary. For the purposes of an emergency modification of visitation, however, the Court finds no such change is warranted.

Additionally, Mother conceded her last update to Father regarding therapy was over five months ago. As noted in the Custody Order, “*Mother has a responsibility to provide upon request to Father all material information concerning the children’s progress in school, medical treatment, significant developments in the children’s lives, school activities and conferences, special religious events, and other activities in which*

---

<sup>21</sup> *T.B.*, 2026 WL 446570 at \*17.

<sup>22</sup> *Id.* at \*20.

*Father may wish to participate, unless specifically restricted in this Order.*<sup>23</sup>

Accordingly, when Father requests information about school, therapy, medical care, or other activities, Mother has an affirmative duty to provide that information instead of withholding it until further order of the Court.

### **Attorney's Fees**

Having denied Mother's emergency motion, the Court now turns to Father's request for attorney's fees and costs. In custody disputes, the ordinary rule that "each party bears its own costs regardless of the outcome of the case" has been "modified" but not "entirely abrogate[d]."<sup>24</sup> This Court has "broad discretion"<sup>25</sup> to hold parties accountable for "excessively litigious conduct, a pattern of vexatious filings, or . . . bad faith"<sup>26</sup> after considering "the legal and factual basis for the action, the results obtained, the financial resources of the parties, and such other factors as the Court deems just and equitable."<sup>27</sup> The Court further notes that, before making requests of the Court, a party or their attorney must certify, based on "an inquiry reasonable under the circumstances," that the petition or motion has been filed for a proper purpose and is or will be supported by the evidence.<sup>28</sup> If a party or attorney falls short of that duty, attorney's fees and other sanctions may be imposed upon the party, the attorney, or the attorney's law firm.<sup>29</sup>

Both parties to this custody dispute are represented by counsel. While the Court has previously heard evidence that Mother's financial resources are somewhat greater, the parties' relative finances are not dispositive here, as both have proved capable of retaining lawyers in this matter and in parallel contempt, child support, and divorce proceedings.

---

<sup>23</sup> *Id.* at \*27.

<sup>24</sup> *Smith v. Francisco*, No. 230, 2000, 2001 WL 578571, at \*2 (Del. May 16, 2001).

<sup>25</sup> *Smith v. Francisco*, 737 A.2d 1000, 1009 (Del. 1999).

<sup>26</sup> *M.C. v. S.C. & S.C.*, Nos. CN24-01763 & CN24-01782, 2024 WL 4345511, at \*5 (Del. Fam. Ct. June 13, 2024) (Hirst, J.); *accord Smith*, 2001 WL 578571 at \*2.

<sup>27</sup> 13 *Del. C.* § 731; *see also* Del. Fam. Ct. Civ. R. 88.

<sup>28</sup> Del. Fam. Ct. Civ. R. 11(b).

<sup>29</sup> Del. Fam. Ct. Civ. R. 11(c).

An award of attorney’s fees to Father is justified, however, by Mother’s filing of this Petition to Modify Visitation coupled with the pending Petition Rule to Show Cause with similar concerns, taken together with the evidentiary weakness of Mother’s emergency motion discussed herein. Barely four months after the Court’s custody order in this case—and just days after Father’s unsupervised visitation started—Mother has filed a petition for contempt and this emergency motion to modify visitation, raising many allegations identical or similar to those already adjudicated. Although the Rule to Show Cause matter is yet to be heard, the emergency hearing on this motion revealed a disturbing chasm between her graphic trial testimony and the anodyne content of her own documentary evidence. It may be that more persuasive evidence will emerge at the final hearing, but a party seeking emergency relief must at that time have a good-faith factual basis for the claim that “immediate and irreparable harm will otherwise result.”<sup>30</sup> Mother has not identified one here. Because the evidence does not corroborate Mother’s assertions and because their timing and volume suggests vexatious litigation, equity demands that Father not bear the cost to defend against her claims.

### **Conclusion**

The evidence presented to the Court does not show a reasonable probability that the children will suffer immediate and irreparable harm if Father is permitted to continue unsupervised parenting time pending a final trial. Mother’s motion for emergency modification is therefore **DENIED**. The Final Custody Order issued on February 4, 2026, remains in full force and effect. Because many of Mother’s allegations were plainly unsupported by the evidence, she is ordered to pay the attorney’s fees reasonably incurred by Father in defending this emergency motion. Father shall have thirty (30) days from the date of this Order to submit an Affidavit of Attorney’s Fees and Costs. Lastly, because the issues raised in the Petition Rule to Show Cause and the Petition to Modify Visitation are based on the same facts and issues, the Court shall consolidate the cases. The Court has already scheduled a Case Management Conference for

---

<sup>30</sup> See Del. Fam. Ct. Civ. R. 65.2.

**R----- v. B-----**

File No. CN25-01007; Pet. No. 26-12060

Page **14** of **14**

June 25, 2026

Emergency Visitation Modification Order

**September 14, 2026, at 2:00 p.m.** via Zoom, which will address these consolidated matters.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

June 25, 2026

Date Written Order Issued

/ Eliza M. Hirst /

**ELIZA HIRST, JUDGE**

cc: Petitioner via email and regular mail  
Respondent(s) via regular mail  
Date emailed/mailed: 06/25/2026