

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

BRUCE S. JOYNER,	§
	§
Plaintiff Below-	§ No. 372, 2003
Appellant,	§
	§
v.	§
	§
THE NEWS JOURNAL,	§ Court Below—Superior Court
TRAVELERS INSURANCE	§ of the State of Delaware,
COMPANY, and MEREDITH	§ in and for New Castle County
HASKELL,	§ C.A. No. 03A-05-004
	§
Plaintiff Below-	§
Appellee.	§

Submitted: November 21, 2003

Decided: December 18, 2003

Before **VEASEY**, Chief Justice, **HOLLAND**, and **BERGER**, Justices.

ORDER

This 18th day of December 2003, upon consideration of the parties' briefs, the appellees' motion to dismiss, and the appellant's response thereto, it appears to the Court that:

(1) On July 29, 2003, the plaintiff below, Bruce Joyner, filed a notice of appeal, purporting to appeal from an order of the Superior Court dated May 14, 2003. The May 14 order dismissed Joyner's appeal to the Superior Court from an order of the Industrial Accident Board because

Joyner had failed to file the necessary paperwork, despite the Superior Court's instructions.

(2) The appellees filed a motion to dismiss Joyner's appeal to this Court on the ground that Joyner failed to file his notice of appeal in a timely manner. Joyner responded to the motion to dismiss. Joyner asserted that his appeal was timely filed because, in addition to appealing the May 14 order, he also was appealing another order of the Superior Court dated June 30, 2003. The Superior Court's June 30 order informed Joyner that his case had been closed and that the Superior Court would not accept further filings from him in the case. Joyner contended that his notice of appeal was filed within thirty days of the June 30 order and, therefore, his appeal from both orders was timely. The appellees replied that Joyner had never filed a notice of appeal from the June 30 order and that Joyner's time to file an appeal from the June 30 order had long since expired.

(3) Without reaching the issue of timeliness, the Court finds that Joyner's appeal must be dismissed on alternative grounds, which were raised by the appellees in their answering brief on appeal. On September 3, 2003, Joyner filed a set of documents with the Court that purported to be his opening brief on appeal. The documents, which total over 100 pages, are a random amalgamation of correspondence, transcripts, and reports spanning a period

of more than six years. There is nothing in the set of documents that remotely resembles a statement of facts or a presentation of arguments for the Court's consideration on appeal. Although the Court affords some degree of leniency to self-represented litigants as to briefing requirements, an appellant's opening brief, at a minimum, must be adequate so that the Court can conduct a meaningful review of the merits of the appellant's claims.* In this appeal, Joyner presents no claims whatsoever. Accordingly, in the absence of any claims for review, the appeal must be dismissed.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the within appeal hereby is DISMISSED.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Randy J. Holland
Justice

* *Yancey v. National Trust Co.*, 1998 WL 309819 (Del. May 19, 1998).