

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

STATE OF DELAWARE,

v.

BRANDON R. NORMAN,

Defendant.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)

ID No. 2203010974

ORDER

On this 21st day of September, 2026, upon consideration of Brandon Norman'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 September 13, 2023, Defendant was found guilty of Assault Second Degree, Possession of a Deadly Weapon During the Commission of a Felony (PDWDCF), Terroristic Threatening, Endangering the Welfare of a Child, Criminal Mischief, and numerous motor vehicle violations.²

2. On December 15, 2023, the Court sentenced Defendant to an aggregate sentence of thirty-two years, suspended upon serving five years at Level V, followed by decreasing levels of probation supervision.³ Defendant appealed his conviction,

¹ Docket Item (hereinafter "D.I.") 61 (hereinafter "Mot."). Defendant also invokes Super. Ct. Crim. R. 61 in the Motion. However, the only requested relief is a sentence reduction. Accordingly, Rule 35(b) governs the Motion.

² D.I. 33.

³ D.I. 35.

and, on September 12, 2024, the Delaware Supreme Court affirmed the judgment of this Court.⁴

3. On August 6, 2024, Defendant filed a *pro se* Motion for Sentence Modification.⁵ The Court denied this motion on November 1, 2024.⁶

4. On July 9, 2026, Defendant filed the instant Motion requesting that the Court reduce his sentence to three years at Level V followed by Level III probation or a suspension of his current Level IV time or any relief the Court deems applicable.⁷ The basis for this request was Defendant's expression of accountability and completion of certain rehabilitation programs.⁸

5. 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.⁹

6. Rule 35(b) mandates that the Court will not consider repetitive requests for sentence reduction.¹⁰ A Rule 35(b) motion is considered repetitive even if the

⁴ *Norman v. State*, 326 A.3d 1202 (Del. 2024).

⁵ D.I. 48.

⁶ D.I. 50.

⁷ Mot. at 4.

⁸ *Id.* at 2–4.


⁹ *State v. Redden*, 111 A.3d 602, 606 (Del. Super. 2015).

¹⁰ Super. Ct. Crim. R. 35(b).

later motion raises new arguments.¹¹ The bar to repetitive motions has no exception.¹²

7. Defendant previously requested reduction or modification of his sentence.¹³ As mandated by Rule 35(b), this Motion is repetitive, and it cannot be considered by the Court. Hence, Defendant's Motion is **DENIED**

IT IS SO ORDERED.



Sheldon K. Rennie, Judge

¹¹ *State v. Culp*, 152 A.3d 141, 144 (Del. 2016).

¹² *Id.*

¹³ *See* D.I. 48.