

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

STATE OF DELAWARE,

v.

HARRY W. ANDERSON,

Defendant.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)

ID No. 2408003609

ORDER

On this 21st day of September, 2026, upon consideration of Harry Anderson’s (“Defendant”) *pro se* Motion to Modify Sentence (the “Motion”) made pursuant to Superior Court Rule of Criminal Procedure (“Rule”) 35(b),¹ the sentence imposed upon Defendant, and the record in this case, it appears to the Court that:

1. On July 25, 2025, Defendant pled guilty to Possession of a Firearm by a Person Prohibited (PFBPP) and Disregarding a Police Officer’s Signal.²

2. On May 15, 2026, the Court sentenced Defendant to 8 years of unsuspended time at Level V, followed by decreasing levels of probation supervision.³

¹ Docket Item (hereinafter “D.I.”) 52 (hereinafter “Mot.”) in Case ID No. 2408003609. All references to the docket herein refer to Case ID No. 2408003609.

² D.I. 45.

³ D.I. 51. Specifically, Defendant’s sentence was 15 years at Level V, with credit for 44 days previously served, suspended after 8 years, followed by 10 years at Level IV DOC discretion, suspended after 6 months, followed by 18 months at Level III. The first 5 years of this sentence is a mandatory term of incarceration.


3. On August 12, 2026, Defendant filed the Motion, requesting that the Court reduce his Level V sentence to 5 years.⁴ The basis for Defendant's request was his efforts towards rehabilitation while incarcerated and the hardship his incarceration imposes on his family.⁵

4. 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.⁶ There are no applicable procedural bars, and thus the Court considers the Motion on the merits.

5. 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.

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

IT IS SO ORDERED.



Sheldon K. Rennie, Judge

⁴ Mot. at 2.

⁵ *Id.* at 1–2.

⁶ *State v. Redden*, 111 A.3d 602, 606 (Del. Super. 2015).