

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

BLAKE SPENCER, ¹	§
	§ No. 384, 2026
Petitioner Below,	§
Appellant,	§ Court Below–Family Court
	§ of the State of Delaware
v.	§
	§ File No. CN17-04244
VERNON ARCHER,	§ Petition No. 26-13791
	§
Respondent Below,	§
Appellee.	§

Submitted: September 10, 2026

Decided: September 28, 2026

Before **TRAYNOR, LEGROW, and GRIFFITHS**, Justices.

ORDER

After consideration of the notice to show cause and the appellant’s response, it appears to the Court that:

(1) On August 27, 2026, Blake Spencer filed a notice of appeal purportedly from a Family Court order dated August 7, 2026. But that “order” was a letter written by a judicial assistant, not a court order. The notice of appeal was therefore deemed to be a notice of appeal from the Family Court’s most recent order, which was issued on July 24, 2026. Because a timely notice of appeal from that order was due on or before August 24,² the Senior Court Clerk issued a notice directing Spencer

¹ The Court previously assigned pseudonyms to the parties under Supreme Court Rule 7(d).

² Del. Supr. Ct. R. 6(a)(i).

to show cause why this appeal should not be dismissed as untimely filed. In response to the notice to show cause, Spencer acknowledges that she wants to appeal the Family Court's July 24 order, but she does not address the untimeliness of the appeal.

(2) Time is a jurisdictional requirement.³ A notice of appeal must be received by the Court within the applicable time period to be effective.⁴ An appellant's *pro se* status does not excuse a failure to comply strictly with the Court's jurisdictional requirements.⁵ Unless an appellant can demonstrate that her failure to file a timely notice of appeal is attributable to court-related personnel, an untimely appeal cannot be considered.⁶

(3) Spencer does not claim, and the record does not reflect, that her failure to file a timely notice of appeal from the Family Court's order is attributable to court-related personnel. This appeal must therefore be dismissed.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal is DISMISSED under Supreme Court Rule 29(b).

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Abigail M. LeGrow
Justice

³ *Carr v. State*, 554 A.2d 778, 779 (Del.), *cert. denied*, 493 U.S. 829 (1989).

⁴ Del. Supr. Ct. R. 10(a).

⁵ *Rogers v. Morgan*, 2019 WL 168667, at *1 (Del. Jan. 10, 2019).

⁶ *Bey v. State*, 402 A.2d 362, 363 (Del. 1979).