

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

King, Jacob v. DCSS/Pauline King

No. 511, 2025 · No. No. 511, 2025 · Decided February 13, 2026

SUMMARY

The Delaware Supreme Court dismissed Jacob King's appeal from a Family Court commissioner's interim child-support order. The court concluded that King had not responded to a notice to show cause concerning the Supreme Court's jurisdiction, and deemed the dismissal unopposed.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Supreme Court of the State of Delaware
JURISDICTION	Supreme Court of the State of Delaware
DECIDED	February 13, 2026
DOCKET	No. 511, 2025
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Jacob King appealed directly from a Family Court commissioner’s interim order directing him to pay child support. The Delaware Supreme Court issued a notice to show cause why the appeal should not be dismissed for lack of appellate jurisdiction and dismissed the appeal after King failed to respond.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published
PARTIES	Jacob King v. DCSS, Pauline King

TOPICS

- appellate jurisdiction
- family law procedure
- child support
- appellate procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- Family law
- Appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether a direct appeal from a Family Court commissioner’s interim order may be heard by the Delaware Supreme Court.

2. Whether the appeal should be dismissed when the appellant fails to respond to a notice to show cause concerning appellate jurisdiction.

HOLDINGS

1. The Delaware Supreme Court dismissed the direct appeal because an appeal from a Family Court commissioner's interim order is not properly taken directly to the Supreme Court and because the appellant failed to respond to the jurisdictional notice to show cause.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Dismissal of this appeal is therefore deemed to be unopposed. NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the appeal is DISMISSED under Supreme Court Rules 3(b)(2) and 29(b)." (2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A Family Court commissioner ordered Jacob King to pay child support on an interim basis to DCSS and Pauline King. King attempted to appeal the commissioner's order directly to the Delaware Supreme Court. After receiving a notice to show cause regarding appellate jurisdiction, King filed no response.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

A Family Court commissioner entered an interim child-support order. King filed a notice of appeal directly with the Delaware Supreme Court. The Senior Court Clerk issued a notice to show cause concerning the Court's jurisdiction over a direct appeal from a commissioner's order, but King did not respond; the appeal was dismissed as unopposed.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

OPINION

King, Jacob v. DCSS/Pauline King

PER CURIAM.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

JACOB KING,¹ §

§ No. 511, 2025 Respondent Below, § Appellant, § Court Below—Family Court § of the State of Delaware v. § § File No. CN24-05513 DCSS/PAULINE KING, § Petition No. 25-13862 § Petitioners Below, § Appellees. § Submitted: January 20, 2026 Decided: February 13, 2026

ORDER

On December 18, 2025, Jacob King filed a notice of appeal from a Family Court commissioner's order directing him to pay child support on an interim basis to the petitioners below. The Senior Court Clerk issued a notice, sent by certified mail, to King instructing him to show cause why this appeal should not be dismissed for the Court's lack of jurisdiction to hear an appeal taken directly

from a Family Court commissioner's order.² King received the notice to show cause on January 6, 2025. A timely response to the notice to show cause was due on or before January 1. The Court previously assigned pseudonyms to the parties under Supreme Court Rule 7(d). ² See 10 Del. C. § 915(d)(1), (2) (detailing procedures for filing appeals from final and interim orders issued by commissioners); Del. Fam. Ct. Civ. P. R. 53.1(a) ("An interim or final order of a commissioner may be appealed to a judge of the [Family] Court....").

16. To date, King has not responded to the notice to show cause. Dismissal of this appeal is therefore deemed to be unopposed. NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the appeal is DISMISSED under Supreme Court Rules 3(b)(2) and 29(b). BY THE COURT: /s/ Abigail M. LeGrow Justice 2