

Here, although Claimant’s brief includes a section labeled “Statement of Questions Involved,” the Statement itself posits no legal questions or issues for our review.¹

Moreover, neither the Summary of Argument section nor the Argument section includes properly developed legal arguments. In fact, Claimant’s thirteen-page “Argument” section is little more than a rambling narrative. The Argument also contains no citations to case law, statutes, or relevant legal authority in violation of Rule 2119(a) and (b). These deficiencies are fatal to Claimant’s petition.

Rule 2101 states:

Briefs and reproduced records **shall conform in all material respects** with the requirements of these rules as nearly as the circumstances of the particular case will admit, otherwise they may be suppressed, and, **if the defects are in the brief or reproduced record of the appellant and are substantial, the appeal or other matter may be quashed or dismissed.**

Pa. R.A.P. 2101 (emphasis added); *see Means v. Housing Authority*, 747 A.2d 1286, 1289 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2000) (quashing *pro se* appeal due to appellant’s substantial non-compliance with appellate rules); *Dalesandro v. Unemployment Compensation Board*

¹ For example, Claimant’s Statement of Questions Involved includes questions such as:

How can my right lateral epicondylitis [*sic*] be resolved when I saw Dr. Maurer after seeing their doctor and he did surgery cutting out and tendonitis that was not healing properly? . . .

How can they say it is not from work and I even saw Dr. Maurer before I gave work two weeks notice about arm still not right having pain worse at times then other times and worse at work doing data entry?

(Claimant’s Brief at 6.)

of Review, 625 A.2d 1291, 1291-92 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1993) (declining to consider merits of appeal where issues were not properly raised or developed in appellate brief); *Lucarelli v. Workers' Compensation Appeal Board (Emerson Electric)*, 546 A.2d 151, 152 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1988) (quashing claimant's appeal due to substantial defects in brief, which impaired this court's ability to conduct meaningful appellate review).

We reiterate the oft-stated principle that a “lay person who chooses to represent himself in a legal proceeding must assume the risk that his lack of expertise and legal training may prove to be his undoing.” *Daly v. Unemployment Compensation Board of Review*, 631 A.2d 720, 722 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1993). While we are generally inclined to construe *pro se* filings liberally, *see Means*, 747 A.2d at 1289, Claimant's substantial non-compliance with the Pennsylvania Rules of Appellate Procedure precludes our meaningful review of the case.

Accordingly, we quash Claimant's petition.

ROCHELLE S. FRIEDMAN, Senior Judge

