

NON-PRECEDENTIAL DECISION - SEE SUPERIOR COURT I.O.P. 65.37

BRYANT BARR

Appellant

v.

PUBLIC STORAGE

Appellee

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF
PENNSYLVANIA

No. 1520 EDA 2012

Appeal from the Order Entered April 27, 2012
In the Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County
Civil Division at No(s): 10-55521

BEFORE: FORD ELLIOTT, P.J.E., MUNDY, J., and FITZGERALD, J.*

JUDGMENT ORDER BY MUNDY, J.:

Filed: January 15, 2013

Appellant, Bryant Barr, appeals *pro se* from the April 27, 2012¹ order granting summary judgment in favor of Appellee, Public Storage. After careful review, we dismiss this appeal without reaching the merits.

Generally, parties to an appeal are required to submit briefs in conformity, in all material respects, with the requirements of the Pennsylvania Rules of Appellate Procedure, as nearly as the circumstances of the particular case will allow. **See** Pa.R.A.P. 2101, **Conformance with**

* Former Justice specially assigned to the Superior Court.

¹ Although Appellant purports to appeal from an order entered on May 22, 2012, our review of the record reveals that the order complained of was entered on April 27, 2012. As this error does not affect the timeliness of this appeal, we have amended the caption accordingly.

Requirements. Rules 2114 through 2119 specify the material to be included in briefs on appeal. **See** Pa.R.A.P. 2114-2119.

In the instant matter, Appellant's brief is substantially noncompliant with the aforementioned rules, in particular Rule 2119. **See** Pa.R.A.P. 2119,

Argument. Appellant's argument section consists of a single paragraph wherein Appellant cites neither the record nor any legal authority in support of his averments. **See** Appellant's Brief at 6.²

Although we are willing to liberally construe materials filed by a *pro se* litigant, *pro se* status confers no special benefit upon an appellant. ***In re Ullman***, 995 A.2d 1207, 1212 (Pa. Super. 2010), *appeal denied*, 20 A.3d 489 (Pa. 2011). "To the contrary, any person choosing to represent himself in a legal proceeding must, to a reasonable extent, assume that his lack of expertise and legal training will be his undoing." ***Id.*** (citation omitted). "This Court will not act as counsel and will not develop arguments on behalf of an appellant." ***Commonwealth v. Kane***, 10 A.3d 327, 331 (Pa. Super. 2010) (citation omitted), *appeal denied*, 29 A.3d 796 (Pa. 2011).

As the defects in Appellant's brief are substantial, we are prevented from conducting meaningful appellate review. Accordingly, pursuant to Rule 2101, we dismiss this appeal.

Appeal dismissed. Appeal stricken from argument list.

² We note that Appellant's brief lacks pagination. For the ease of our discussion, however, we have assigned each page a corresponding number.