

**THE COURT OF APPEALS
ELEVENTH APPELLATE DISTRICT
PORTAGE COUNTY, OHIO**

LORI A. FERRY,	:	MEMORANDUM OPINION
Plaintiff-Appellant,	:	
- vs -	:	CASE NO. 2009-P-0051
RICHARD L. FERRY,	:	
Defendant-Appellee,	:	
(PORTAGE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF	:	
JOB AND FAMILY SERVICES, CHILD	:	
SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT AGENCY,	:	
Appellee.)	:	

Civil Appeal from the Court of Common Pleas, Domestic Relations Division, Case No. 93 DR 0182.

Judgment: Appeal dismissed.

Lori A. Ferry, pro se, 2145 Corbin Place, Unit D, Palm Harbor, FL 34683 (Plaintiff-Appellant).

Richard L. Ferry, pro se, 1003 18th Avenue, Altoona, PA 16601 (Defendant-Appellee).

Victor V. Viglucci, Portage County Prosecutor, 241 South Chestnut Street, Ravenna, OH 44266 and *Roxana R. Lyle*, Child Support Enforcement Agency, 209 South Chestnut Street, Rm. 201, P.O. Box 1208, Ravenna, OH 44266 (For Appellee Portage County Department of Job and Family Services, Child Support Enforcement Agency).

MARY JANE TRAPP, P.J.

{¶1} Lori A. Ferry filed a notice of appeal from a judgment of the Domestic Relations Division of the Portage County Common Pleas Court regarding her child support dispute with her ex-husband, Richard L. Ferry.

{¶2} She filed a “Motion to Determine Arrearages and for Payment of Arrearages.” The magistrate held a hearing on the motion on July 21, 2009. Mrs. Ferry, unrepresented by counsel in this matter, did not appear at the hearing. The magistrate thereafter issued a decision, determining the arrearages owed by Mr. Ferry as of July 20, 2009, to be \$65,492.17 and ordering him to make monthly child support payments in the amount of \$200.

{¶3} The trial court signed the magistrate’s decision but did not set forth the entire ruling of the court on the matter of arrearages. Upon Mrs. Ferry’s appeal, this court remanded this case for the trial court to issue a full judgment. Upon remand, the trial court issued a decision adopting the magistrate’s decision noting that Mr. Ferry, who has a permanent disability, is now entitled to social security benefits, and that Mrs. Ferry has begun to receive the social security payments on behalf of their child, which exceeds Mr. Ferry’s obligations. Therefore, the trial court added the clarification that the \$200 monthly payment is to be applied to the arrearages.

{¶4} With the judgment issued by the trial court upon remand, we now have a final appealable order. However, instead of filing an appellate brief in compliance with App.R. 16, Mrs. Ferry filed a document in a letter form, which voiced her frustration with the low monthly child support payments but presented no assignments of error or legal arguments. Although she cited several statutes, she did not articulate any specific errors or specific legal arguments for us to consider. In her own words, “all I am asking

for is more consideration to [sic] finally to the plaintiff Lori A. Ferry (Hilling) and my children.”

{¶5} We recognize pro se litigants should be granted reasonable leeway, but here the deficiencies of Mrs. Ferry’s filing are not merely technical. Although we understand that Mrs. Ferry is dissatisfied with the amount of payment ordered by the trial court, in the absence of assignments of error and pointed legal arguments that inform this court what mistakes she believes were made by the trial court and where such mistakes appear in the record, we are simply unable to review this appeal. Pursuant to App.R. 16 and Loc.R. 16(B)(4)(c), the appeal is dismissed.

{¶6} Appeal dismissed.

DIANE V. GRENDELL, J.,

TIMOTHY P. CANNON, J.,

concur.