

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

Parham v. State

Parham · No. No. 387, 2024 · Decided January 15, 2026

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE WALIKE C. PARHAM, § § No. 387, 2024 Defendant Below, § Appellant, § Court Below–Superior Court § of the State of Delaware v. § § Cr. ID Nos. 2205008776A&B (N) STATE OF DELAWARE, § § Appellee. § § Submitted: October 23, 2025 Decided: January 15, 2026 Before SEITZ, Chief Justice; LEGROW and GRIFFITHS, Justices. ORDER After consideration of the no-merit brief and motion to withdraw filed by the appellant’s counsel under Supreme Court Rule 26(c), the appellee’s response, and the Superior Court record, it appears to the Court that: (1) In May 2022, Walike Parham was charged in a multiple-count indictment with, among other things, three counts of attempted first-degree murder, two counts of theft of a motor vehicle, and multiple firearm offenses.

Following an eight-day trial, a Superior Court jury found Parham guilty of three counts of attempted first-degree murder, two counts of possession of a firearm during the commission of a felony, two counts of theft of a motor vehicle, two counts of first- degree conspiracy, two counts of second-degree conspiracy, two counts of criminal mischief, and one count of resisting arrest.

Thereafter, the Superior Court found Parham guilty of two counts of possession of a firearm by a person prohibited. Following a presentence investigation, the Superior Court sentenced Parham to a total of 56 years of incarceration followed by probation. This is Parham’s direct appeal.

(2) Parham’s counsel on appeal has filed a brief and a motion to withdraw under Rule 26(c). Counsel asserts that, after a complete and careful examination of the record, he can identify no arguably appealable issues. Counsel informed Parham of the provisions of Rule 26(c) and provided him with a copy of the motion to withdraw and a draft of the accompanying brief.

Counsel also informed Parham of his right to supplement his attorney’s presentation. Parham has not raised any issues for the Court’s consideration. The State has responded to the Rule 26(c) brief and has moved to affirm the Superior Court’s judgment.

(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 claims that could be arguably be raised on appeal.¹ Second, the Court must conduct its own review of the record and

determine 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 whether the appeal is so totally devoid of at least arguably appealable issues that it can be decided without an adversary presentation.² (4) The Court has reviewed the record carefully and has concluded that Parham's appeal is wholly without merit and devoid of any arguably appealable issues.

We also are satisfied that Parham's counsel has made a conscientious effort to examine the record and the law and has properly determined that Parham could not raise a meritorious claim in this 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 2 *Penson*, 488 U.S. at 81-82.

3