

**NON-PRECEDENTIAL DECISION - SEE SUPERIOR COURT I.O.P. 65.37**

MIKE SKRZYPCZAK

Appellant

v.

GRAZYNA SKRZYPCZAK

Appellee

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF  
PENNSYLVANIA

No. 2727 EDA 2012

Appeal from the Decree August 31, 2012  
In the Court of Common Pleas of Lehigh County  
Civil Division at No(s): 2008-FC-1012

MIKE SKRZYPCZAK

Appellant

v.

GRAZYNA SKRZYPCZAK

Appellee

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF  
PENNSYLVANIA

No. 2728 EDA 2012

Appeal from the Order Entered August 30, 2012  
In the Court of Common Pleas of Lehigh County  
Civil Division at No(s): 2008-FC-1012

BEFORE: DONOHUE, J., MUNDY, J., and OLSON, J.

JUDGMENT ORDER BY MUNDY, J.:

**FILED JUNE 05, 2013**

Appellant, Mike Skrzypczak (Husband), appeals from the August 31, 2012 decree, entering the final decree of divorce from Appellee, Grazyna Skrzypczak (Wife), and ordering him to pay \$65,000.00 to Wife as equitable distribution of marital assets. Husband also appeals from the August 30,

2012 order, lifting the stay of the May 12, 2011 order finding Husband in contempt and sentencing him to 180 days in Lehigh County Prison unless he places \$44,000.00 from a workman's compensation settlement in escrow. After careful review, we dismiss this appeal.

Generally, appellate briefs are required to conform to the Rules of Appellate Procedure. **See** Pa.R.A.P. 2101. "This Court may ... dismiss an appeal if the appellant fails to conform to the requirements set forth in the Pennsylvania Rules of Appellate Procedure." ***In re Ullman***, 995 A.2d 1207, 1211 (Pa. Super. 2010) (citation omitted), *appeal denied*, 20 A.3d 489 (Pa. 2011). This Court is willing to construe *pro se* materials liberally, but "*pro se* status confers no special benefit on an appellant." ***Id.*** at 1211-1212. "Any layperson choosing to represent himself in a legal proceeding must, to some reasonable extent, assume the risk that his lack of expertise and legal training will prove his undoing." ***Warner v. Univ. of Pa. Health Sys.***, 874 A.2d 644, 648 (Pa. Super. 2005) (citation omitted).

In his brief, Husband presents five issues for review, but fails to divide his argument into separate sections. **See** Husband's Brief at 4-5, 6. Rather, Husband's combined argument for all issues is approximately one page. ***Id.*** at 6-7. Pursuant to Pennsylvania Rule of Appellate Procedure 2119(a), "[t]he argument shall be divided into as many parts as there are questions to be argued ... followed by such discussion and citation of authorities as are deemed pertinent." Pa.R.A.P. 2119(a). In addition, Husband does not cite

to any legal authority in support of his argument. “This Court will not act as counsel and will not develop arguments on behalf of an appellant.” **Bombar v. W. Am. Ins. Co.**, 932 A.2d 78, 93 (Pa. Super. 2007) (citation omitted). As we have consistently held, “[t]his Court will not consider the merits of an argument which fails to cite relevant case or statutory authority.” **In re Estate of Whitley**, 50 A.3d 203, 209 (Pa. Super. 2012) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted).

Based on the foregoing, we conclude that the defects in Husband’s brief are substantial and prevent us from conducting any meaningful appellate review.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, we elect to exercise our discretion pursuant to Rule 2101 and dismiss this appeal.

Appeal dismissed.

---

<sup>1</sup> We note that even if we could address Appellant’s issues, we would nevertheless deem them waived. Our Supreme Court has recently held that “Rule 1925(b) sets out a simple bright-line rule, which obligates an appellant to file and serve a Rule 1925(b) statement, when so ordered[.]” **Commonwealth v. Hill**, 16 A.3d 484, 494 (Pa. 2011). In the instant case, the trial court ordered Appellant to file a Rule 1925(b) statement on October 11, 2012. The statement was due 21 days from the date of this filing, on November 1, 2012. Appellant filed a “Concise List of Errors” on November 7, 2012. Even if we were to construe this filing as a Rule 1925(b) statement, it would be untimely, resulting in waiver of all issues on appeal. **See id.**

J-S29026-13

Judgment Entered.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kevin Gambetti", written over a horizontal line.

Prothonotary

Date: 6/5/2013