

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

STATE OF DELAWARE,

v.

EVELYN RENDLE,

Defendant.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)

ID No. 2503004426

ORDER

On this 21st day of September, 2026, upon consideration of Evelyn Rendle's ("Defendant") *pro se* motion for Sentence Modification,¹ the sentence imposed upon Defendant, and the record in this case, it appears to the Court that:

1. On July 15, 2026, the Defendant was found to have violated her probation related to misdemeanor possession of controlled substances and to driving while under the influence ("DUI").² On the possession charge, Defendant was sentenced to 6 months of Level V time, suspended after 90 days with no probation to follow.³ On the DUI charge, Defendant was sentenced to 1 year and 9 months of Level V time suspended upon the completion of a substance abuse treatment program, followed by 1 year Level II probation with aftercare.⁴

¹ Docket Item (hereinafter "D.I.") 34 (hereinafter "Mot.") in Case ID No. 2503004426. All references to the docket herein refer to Case ID No. 2503004426.

² See D.I. 33.

³ See D.I. 33.

⁴ See D.I. 33.


2. On August 7, 2026, Defendant filed a *pro se* motion requesting that the Court reduce her Level V sentence to between 90-120 days and eliminate her Level III sentence and aftercare.⁵ The basis for Defendant's request was her desire to move to North Carolina with her husband following his multiple major surgeries.⁶

3. The Court considers motions for modification of sentence under Rule 35(b). Before addressing the merits of a motion, the Court first considers the applicable procedural bars.⁷ There are no applicable procedural bars, and thus the Court considers the Motion on the merits.

4. The Motion is denied. Defendant's sentence was appropriate at the time of sentencing. The Court imposed the sentence after a thorough review of the nature of the violation and the sentencing information available on the record, and the Court declines to recalibrate an appropriate sentence on the basis articulated by Defendant.

5. Accordingly, Defendant's Motion for Sentence Modification is **DENIED.**

IT IS SO ORDERED.



Sheldon K. Rennie, Judge

⁵ Mot. p. 4.

⁶ *Id.*

⁷ *State v. Redden*, 111 A.3d 602, 606 (Del. Super. 2015).