

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

Langston v. Hennley

No. 51, 2026 · No. No. 51, 2026 · Decided March 18, 2026

OPINION

Langston, Nathan v. Sarah Hennley

PER CURIAM.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

NATHAN LANGSTON,¹ §

§ Petitioner Below, § No. 51, 2026 Appellant, § § Court Below—Family Court v. § of the State of Delaware § SARAH HENNLEY, § File No. CN26-01168 § Petition No. 26-01196 Respondent Below, § Appellee. § Submitted: March 10, 2026 Decided: March 18, 2026

ORDER

(1) The appellant filed a notice of appeal seeking review of orders entered by a Family Court Commissioner relating to procedural matters in a protection from abuse proceeding. The appellant also filed documents styled as a petition for a writ of mandamus. The Senior Court Clerk issued a notice, by certified mail, directing the appellant to show cause why the appeal should not be dismissed because the orders are interlocutory and this Court lacks jurisdiction to consider an appeal from the decision of a Family Court Commissioner. The notice also directed the appellant to show cause why the writ petition should not be dismissed because it fails to demonstrate entitlement to mandamus relief. 1 The Court previously assigned pseudonyms to the parties under Supreme Court Rule 7(d).

(2) Postal records reflect that the postal service attempted delivery of the certified mail on February 12 and 17, 2026, but no authorized recipient was available; notice of the attempted delivery was left at the address. On February 26, 2026, the Chief Deputy Clerk reissued the notice to show cause by first-class mail. The appellant having failed to respond to the notice to show cause within the required ten-day period, dismissal of this action is deemed unopposed. NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED, under Supreme Court Rules 3(b)(2) and 29(b), that the appeal is DISMISSED. BY THE COURT: /s/ Collins J. Seitz, Jr. Chief Justice 2