



IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

JAMES L. MARTIN,	§
	§ No. 58, 2025
Plaintiff Below,	§
Appellant,	§ Court Below—Superior Court
	§ of the State of Delaware
v.	§
	§ C.A. No. N21C-12-195
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.	§

Submitted: September 26, 2025  
Decided: November 24, 2025

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

**ORDER**

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>

---

<sup>1</sup> *Martin v. Hudson*, 2025 WL 101645 (Del. Super. Ct. Jan. 14, 2025).

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

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

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



## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

JAMES L. MARTIN,	§
Plaintiff Below, Appellant,	§ No. 58, 2025
v.	§
BRUCE L. HUDSON, AS	§ Court Below—Superior Court
SUCCESSOR TO THE LATE BEN	§ of the State of Delaware
T. CASTLE; BRUCE L. HUDSON,	§
AS AN ATTORNEY WHO	§
PURPORTED TO REPRESENT	§
THE PLAINTIFF; and HUDSON	§
AND CASTLE LAW, LLC,	§
Defendants Below, Appellees.	§
	§

ORDER

This 9<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2025, the Court has carefully considered the motion for a stay of this Court's November 24, 2025 decision filed by the appellant. It is clear that the motion, which relates to the underlying personal-injury action and not the legal-malpractice action at issue in this appeal, is without merit and should be denied.

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

BY THE COURT:

/s/ N. Christopher Griffiths  
Justice