

JAMES L. MARTIN,

V.

Defendants Below,  
Appellees.

§ No. 58, 2025  
§  
§ Court Below—Superior Court  
§ of the State of Delaware  
§  
§ C.A. No. N21C-12-195  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Before **SEITZ**, Chief Justice; **LEGROW** and **GRIFFITHS**, Justices.

After consideration of the parties’ briefs and the record on appeal, we find it evident that the judgment below should be affirmed on the basis of and for the reasons cited by the Superior Court in its January 14, 2025 opinion granting the appellees’ motion for summary judgment.<sup>1</sup>

Ex-1a

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the judgment of the Superior Court is AFFIRMED.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ N. Christopher Griffiths  
Justice



IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

JAMES L. MARTIN,

Plaintiff Below,  
Appellant,

v.

BRUCE L. HUDSON, AS  
SUCCESSOR TO THE LATE BEN  
T. CASTLE; BRUCE L. HUDSON,  
AS AN ATTORNEY WHO  
PURPORTED TO REPRESENT  
THE PLAINTIFF; and HUDSON  
AND CASTLE LAW, LLC,

Defendants Below,  
Appellees.

§

§ No. 58, 2025

§

§ Court Below--Superior Court  
§ of the State of Delaware

§

§ C.A. No. N21C-12-195

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

Before **SEITZ**, Chief Justice; **LEGROW** and **GRIFFITHS**, Justices.

**ORDER**

This 9<sup>th</sup> day of December 2025, the Court has carefully considered the motion for reargument filed by the appellant, and it appears that the motion is without merit and should be denied.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the motion for reargument is DENIED.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ N. Christopher Griffiths  
Justice



## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

JAMES L. MARTIN,

Plaintiff Below,  
Appellant,

v.

BRUCE L. HUDSON, AS  
SUCCESSOR TO THE LATE BEN  
T. CASTLE; BRUCE L. HUDSON,  
AS AN ATTORNEY WHO  
PURPORTED TO REPRESENT  
THE PLAINTIFF; and HUDSON  
AND CASTLE LAW, LLC,Defendants Below,  
Appellees.

§

§ No. 58, 2025

§

§ Court Below—Superior Court  
§ of the State of Delaware

§

§ C.A. No. N21C-12-195

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

Before **SEITZ**, Chief Justice; **VALIHURA**, **TRAYNOR**, **LEGROW**, and  
**GRIFFITHS**, Justices, constituting the Court *en banc*.

**ORDER**

This 9<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2025, the Court has carefully considered the motion  
for rehearing *en banc* filed by the appellant, and it appears that the motion is without  
merit and should be denied.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the motion for rehearing *en banc*  
is DENIED.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ N. Christopher Griffiths  
Justice

