

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

NATHAN ENNIS,	§
	§ No. 18, 2026
Defendant Below,	§
Appellant,	§ Court Below–Superior Court
	§ of the State of Delaware
v.	§
	§ Cr. ID No. 2502005749 (S)
STATE OF DELAWARE,	§ 2504001577 (S)
	§
Appellee.	§
	§

Submitted: June 29, 2026
Decided: August 18, 2026

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

ORDER

After consideration of the motion to withdraw filed by the appellant’s counsel under Supreme Court Rule 26(c), the appellee’s response, and the record on appeal, it appears to the Court that:

(1) On October 22, 2025, the appellant, Nathan Ennis, pleaded guilty to one count of strangulation, one count of first-degree unlawful imprisonment, one count of second-degree assault, three counts of endangering the welfare of a child, one count of stalking, one count of second-degree conspiracy, and one count of noncompliance with bond conditions. Following a presentence investigation, the Superior Court sentenced Ennis to a total of eleven years of unsuspended

incarceration followed by decreasing levels of community supervision. This is Ennis's direct appeal.

(2) Ennis's counsel on appeal has filed a motion to withdraw under Rule 26(c). Counsel asserts that, after a conscientious review of the record and the law, she has concluded that this appeal is wholly without merit. In her statement filed under Rule 26(c), counsel states that she informed Ennis of the provisions of Rule 26(c) and provided him with a copy of the motion to withdraw and the accompanying appendix. Counsel also informed Ennis of his right to supplement his attorney's presentation. Ennis has not raised any issues for the Court's consideration. The State has responded to counsel's Rule 26(c) motion and argues that the Superior Court's judgment should be affirmed.

(3) The standard and scope of review applicable to the consideration of a motion to withdraw and an accompanying brief under Rule 26(c) is twofold. First, the Court must be satisfied that defense counsel has made a conscientious examination of the record and the law for arguable claims.¹ Second, the Court must conduct its own review of the record and determine whether "the appeal is indeed so frivolous that it may be decided without an adversary presentation."²

¹ *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 83 (1988); *McCoy v. Court of Appeals of Wis.*, 486 U.S. 429, 442 (1988); *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744 (1967).

² *Penson*, 488 U.S. at 82.

(4) The Court has reviewed the record carefully and has concluded that Ennis's appeal is wholly without merit and devoid of any arguably appealable issues. We also are satisfied that counsel made a conscientious effort to examine the record and the law and properly determined that Ennis could not raise a meritorious claim on appeal.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the judgment of the Superior Court is AFFIRMED. Counsel's motion to withdraw is moot.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ N. Christopher Griffiths
Justice