

\*\*\*\*\*

The “officially released” date that appears near the beginning of each opinion is the date the opinion will be published in the Connecticut Law Journal or the date it was released as a slip opinion. The operative date for the beginning of all time periods for filing postopinion motions and petitions for certification is the “officially released” date appearing in the opinion. In no event will any such motions be accepted before the “officially released” date.

All opinions are subject to modification and technical correction prior to official publication in the Connecticut Reports and Connecticut Appellate Reports. In the event of discrepancies between the electronic version of an opinion and the print version appearing in the Connecticut Law Journal and subsequently in the Connecticut Reports or Connecticut Appellate Reports, the latest print version is to be considered authoritative.

The syllabus and procedural history accompanying the opinion as it appears on the Commission on Official Legal Publications Electronic Bulletin Board Service and in the Connecticut Law Journal and bound volumes of official reports are copyrighted by the Secretary of the State, State of Connecticut, and may not be reproduced and distributed without the express written permission of the Commission on Official Legal Publications, Judicial Branch, State of Connecticut.

\*\*\*\*\*

ANNA MARIA MAZZELLA v. WILLIAM MAZZELLA  
(AC 21711)

Dranginis, Flynn and O’Connell, Js.

Submitted on briefs November 1—officially released November 27, 2001

Counsel

*William Mazzella*, pro se, the appellant (defendant), filed a brief.

*Vincent N. Amendola, Jr.*, and *Denise M. Rioux* filed a brief for the appellee (plaintiff).

*Opinion*

PER CURIAM. In this action for the dissolution of marriage, the defendant, William Mazzella, has appealed from the judgment of the trial court denying his motion to open and modify the judgment of dissolution. We affirm the judgment of the trial court.

“Although we allow pro se litigants some latitude, the right of self-representation provides no attendant license not to comply with relevant rules of procedural . . . law.” (Internal quotation marks omitted.) *Zanoni v. Hudon*, 42 Conn. App. 70, 77, 678 A.2d 12 (1996). “[F]or this court judiciously and efficiently to consider

claims of error raised on appeal . . . the parties must clearly and fully set forth their arguments in their briefs. We do not reverse the judgment of a trial court on the basis of challenges to its rulings that have not been adequately briefed.” (Citation omitted; internal quotation marks omitted.) *New London Federal Savings Bank v. Tucciarone*, 48 Conn. App. 89, 100, 709 A.2d 14 (1998). “Where the parties cite no law and provide no analysis of their claims, we do not review such claims.” *Mullen & Mahon, Inc. v. Mobilmed Support Services, LLC*, 62 Conn. App. 1, 10, 773 A.2d 952 (2001).

The judgment is affirmed.

---