

1. Smith v. State – This is Defendant’s direct appeal from his convictions for possession of a firearm and possession of ammunition by a person prohibited. The sole issue on appeal is the defendant’s argument that the Superior Court (Parkins) erred in refusing to suppress the evidence of the weapon and ammunition. The Superior Court found that there was not probable cause or reasonable suspicion to stop Defendant but concluded that the seizure was justified because Defendant was a witness to his juvenile companion’s “crime” of riding a bicycle at night without a light. Defendant asserts that riding a bicycle at night without a light is not a crime.
  
2. Nash v. Barra – This appeal involves derivative litigation arising from GM’s production of faulty ignition switches. The shareholders appeal the Court of Chancery’s (Glasscock) dismissal of their complaint. Plaintiffs contend on appeal that the court erred by: (i) failing to give Plaintiffs all reasonable inferences to be drawn from the facts; (ii) holding that Plaintiffs failed to properly allege facts sufficient to establish demand futility; and (iii) holding that Plaintiffs didn’t adequately allege a *Caremark* claim.
  
3. Horbal v. Shapira – Plaintiffs/shareholders appeal the Court of Chancery’s (Laster) dismissal of their complaint with prejudice. Plaintiffs asserted breach of fiduciary duty claims against the directors of Seegrid Corp. and Seegrid’s largest shareholder and creditor, Giant Eagle. On appeal, Plaintiffs assert that the court erred in dismissing their complaint with prejudice based on collateral estoppel and lack of standing.