



[Home](#) / [Our Sources](#) / [About Us](#) / [FAQs](#) / [Advanced Search](#)



SEARCH:

Not what you're looking for? [Try an advanced search.](#)

Buy This Entire Record For \$7.95 

Official citation and/or docket number and footnotes (if any) for this case available with purchase.

[Learn more about what you receive with purchase of this case.](#)

[Buy Now](#)

[Add To Cart](#)

06/21/95 WILLIAM J. KEICHLINE v. STATE DELAWARE

SUPREME COURT OF DELAWARE

June 21, 1995

**WILLIAM J. KEICHLINE, SR., DEFENDANT BELOW, APPELLANT,
v.
STATE OF DELAWARE, PLAINTIFF BELOW, APPELLEE**

Court Below--Superior Court of the State of Delaware, in and for New Castle County. Cr.A. Nos. IN89-09-0905R1 through 0915R1.

Before Veasey, Chief Justice, Holland and Hartnett, Justices.

The opinion of the court was delivered by: Holland

ORDER

This 21st day of June, 1995, it appears to the Court that:

1) The defendant-appellant, William J. Keichline, Sr. ("Keichline"), was convicted after a jury trial in the Superior Court in October 1989 of two counts of Rape in the First Degree, two counts of Attempted Rape in the First Degree, two counts of Unlawful Sexual Intercourse in the First Degree, two counts of Unlawful Sexual Contact in the Second Degree, two counts of Attempted Unlawful Sexual Intercourse in the First Degree, and one count of Sexual Exploitation of a Child. On November 3, 1989, Keichline was sentenced to life terms on each count of Rape Attempted Rape Unlawful Sexual Intercourse, and Attempted Unlawful Sexual Intercourse, and to additional prison terms on the Unlawful Sexual Contact and Exploitation charges. On direct appeal, this Court affirmed Keichline's conviction and sentence. Keichline v. State, Del. Supr., No. 490, 1989, Horsey, J. (Aug. 22, 1991)(ORDER).

2) In May 1994, Keichline filed a post-conviction motion, alleging ineffective assistance of trial counsel. On October 28, 1994, the Superior Court denied the motion. This is Keichline's appeal from that post-conviction judgment.

3) In order to prevail on the claim that his trial counsel was ineffective, Keichline must demonstrate (1) that his defense counsel's actions fell below an objective standard of reasonableness and (2) that there exists a reasonable probability that, but for his counsel's unprofessional errors, the result of the trial would have been different. Skinner v. State, Del. Supr., 607 A.2d 1170, 1172 (1992) (citing Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668, 690, 694, 80 L. Ed. 2d 674, 104 S. Ct. 2052 (1984)). In setting forth a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel, a defendant must make and substantiate concrete allegations of actual prejudice or risk summary dismissal. Younger v. State, Del. Supr., 580 A.2d 552, 556 (1990); Robinson v. State, Del. Supr., 562 A.2d 1184, 1185 (1989).

4) The record reflects that the allegations of ineffective assistance of trial counsel by Keichline were conclusory. The record also reflects that Keichline never made any demonstration of actual prejudice. Consequently, the Superior Court's summary denial of Keichline's post-conviction motion was appropriate.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the judgment of the Superior Court be and the same hereby is, AFFIRMED.

BY THE COURT:

Randy J. Holland

Justice

19950621

© 1998 VersusLaw Inc.

{ **Buy This Entire Record For \$7.95**  }

Official citation and/or docket number and footnotes (if any) for this case available with purchase.

[Learn more about what you receive with purchase of this case.](#)

[Buy Now](#)

[Add To Cart](#)

[Home](#) / [Our Sources](#) / [About Us](#) / [FAQs](#) / [Advanced Search](#)

copyright 2014 LRC, Inc. [About Us](#)

[PRIVACY POLICY](#)