
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.

WANDA TRAPPE v. ROBERT D. BOLGARD
(AC 23282)

Dranginis, West and Hennessy, Js.

Submitted on briefs October 30—officially released December 2, 2003

(Appeal from Superior Court, judicial district of
Hartford, Hon. Mary R. Hennessey, judge trial referee;
Hon. Robert J. Hale, judge trial referee.)

Wanda Trappe, pro se, the appellant (plaintiff), filed
a brief.

Christopher J. Hug and *Edward J. Heath* filed a brief
for the appellees (defendants).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. The plaintiff, Wanda Trappe, appeals from the judgment of the trial court rendered after it granted the motion for summary judgment filed by the defendants, Robert D. Bolgard and Fleet Bank, N.A. On appeal, the plaintiff appears to claim that the court failed to consider evidence that would demonstrate that the defendants had engaged in a continuing concealment of facts, which barred the running of the statutes of limitation on her complaint.

Although we attempt to construe the rules of practice liberally in dealing with pro se litigants; see *Rosato v. Rosato*, 53 Conn. App. 387, 390, 731 A.2d 323 (1999); we simply cannot consider a claim when the plaintiff has provided the court with what amounts to a one page brief that is devoid of any legal authority for or analysis of her claim. We decline to review claims when “[n]othing more than [a] bare statement, without citation to legal authority, appears in [the appellant’s] brief. Assignments of error which are merely mentioned but not briefed beyond a statement of the claim will be deemed abandoned and will not be reviewed by this court.” (Internal quotation marks omitted.) *Russell v. Russell*, 61 Conn. App. 106, 108, 762 A.2d 523 (2000). “[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. . . . [A]ssignments of error which are merely mentioned but not briefed beyond a statement of the claim will be deemed abandoned and will not be reviewed by this court. . . . Where the parties cite no law and provide no analysis of their claims, we do not review such claims.” (Internal quotation marks omitted.) *Baris v. Southbend, Inc.*, 68 Conn. App. 546, 550–51, 791 A.2d 713 (2002). Accordingly, we decline to review the plaintiff’s claim and deem it abandoned.

The judgment is affirmed.
