IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

TRAVIS LOGAN,	§	
	§	No. 241, 2026
Defendant Below,	§	
Appellant,	§	Court Below—Superior Court
	§	of the State of Delaware
v.	§	
	§	Cr. ID No. N2006011676
STATE OF DELAWARE,	§	
	§	
Appellee.	§	

Submitted: September 21, 2026
Decided: November 2, 2026

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

ORDER

Upon consideration of the opening brief, the appellee's motion to affirm, and the record below, it appears to the Court that:

(1) Travis Logan filed this appeal from his sentencing for a violation of probation ("VOP"). The State has moved to affirm the Superior Court's judgment on the basis that it is manifest on the face of the opening brief that the appeal is without merit. We agree and affirm.

(2) In March 2022, Logan pleaded guilty to first-degree unlawful sexual contact ("USC"), strangulation, and endangering the welfare of a child. The Superior Court sentenced Logan as follows: for USC, eight years in prison at Level V, suspended for six months of Level IV DOC Discretion, followed by eighteen

months of Level III; for strangulation, five years in prison at Level V, suspended after three years for eighteen months of Level III; and for endangering the welfare of a child, one year in prison at Level V, suspended for one year of Level III.

(3) The Superior Court found Logan in violation of probation in November 2023 and May 2025. In May 2025, the court imposed the following VOP sentence: for USC, five years in prison at Level V, with credit for 224 days previously served, suspended after eighteen months for one year of Level III with GPS monitoring; and for strangulation, two years in prison at Level V, suspended for one year of Level III with GPS monitoring. As to endangering the welfare of a child, the court discharged Logan as unimproved.

(4) In May 2026, a probation officer filed an administrative warrant and VOP report alleging that Logan had violated probation. The warrant and VOP report alleged that Logan had failed to report to probation as directed and had failed to remain at his self-designated location during his curfew period on more than two dozen dates. Logan also allegedly had failed to comply with the applicable sex-offender registration requirements and to participate in required domestic violence and mental health programs. The warrant and VOP report further alleged that Logan had removed his GPS monitoring device on May 6, 2026, and abandoned it on Spruce Street.

(5) At the VOP hearing, Logan, through counsel, admitted to violating the terms of his probation and asked the court to consider imposing a term of imprisonment without a subsequent probationary period. Counsel explained that Logan had difficulty completing probation because he was homeless and not from Delaware. The Superior Court found Logan in violation of probation and sentenced him as follows: for USC, two years and ten months in prison, suspended after successful completion of a program at DOC Discretion for one year of Level III supervision with GPS monitoring; for strangulation, two years in prison, suspended after successful completion of a program at DOC Discretion for one year of Level III supervision with GPS monitoring.

(6) On appeal to this Court, Logan argues that he did not incur new charges, have police contact, refuse treatment, or miss probation appointments. He asserts that he voluntarily turned himself in, is not from Delaware, and worked and volunteered in the community. He contends that his counsel did not sufficiently advocate on his behalf at the VOP hearing. He argues that his sentence is ill-fashioned because it includes probation with GPS monitoring, and he has not previously been able to successfully complete that level of supervision because he does not have a permanent address in Delaware. He also claims that his sentence is excessive and he must wait too long to begin a treatment program.

(7) After careful consideration, we find no merit to Logan's appeal. Although Logan appears to challenge some of the grounds for the alleged VOP, he does not explicitly deny that he violated probation. Moreover, the VOP transcript reflects that Logan appeared at the VOP hearing represented by counsel and admitted the violation. That admission constitutes sufficient evidence to sustain the Superior Court's finding of a VOP.[1] We therefore understand Logan's arguments on appeal to be directed to challenging his sentence.[2]

(8) "It is well-established that appellate review of sentences is extremely limited."[3] Our review of a sentence generally ends upon a determination that the sentence is within the statutory limits prescribed by the legislature.[4] If the sentence falls within the statutory limits, we consider only whether it is based on factual predicates that are false, impermissible, or lack minimal reliability; judicial vindictiveness or bias; or a closed mind.[5] When sentencing a defendant for a VOP, the trial court may impose any period of incarceration up to and including the balance of the Level V prison time remaining to be served on the original sentence.[6]

---

[1] *E.g.*, *Cook v. State*, 206 A.3d 261, 2019 WL 949372, at *1 (Del. Feb. 25, 2019) (TABLE); *Lougheed v. State*, 149 A.3d 241, 2016 WL 5899238, at *2 (Del. Oct. 10, 2016) (TABLE).
[2] We do not consider Logan's claim that his counsel was ineffective. *Holland v. State*, 337 A.3d 1268, 2024 WL 5265274, at *2 (Del. Dec. 31, 2024) (TABLE).
[3] *Kurzmann v. State*, 903 A.2d 702, 714 (Del. 2006).
[4] *Mayes v. State*, 604 A.2d 839, 842 (Del. 1992).
[5] *Kurzmann*, 903 A.2d at 714.
[6] 11 *Del. C.* § 4334(c).

(9) Logan does not assert that the Superior Court imposed more prison time than remained on his original sentences. Nor has he established any other basis to conclude that his VOP sentences are subject to reversal. The Superior Court acted within its discretion when sentencing Logan.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the motion to affirm is GRANTED and the judgment of the Superior Court is AFFIRMED.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Abigail M. LeGrow
Justice