

NON-PRECEDENTIAL DECISION - SEE SUPERIOR COURT I.O.P. 65.37

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,

Appellee

v.

ROBERT DANIEL TAMON-ADAMS,

Appellant

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF
PENNSYLVANIA

No. 807 WDA 2012

Appeal from the Judgment of Sentence of April 18, 2012,
in the Court of Common Pleas of Allegheny County,
Criminal Division at No. CP-02-SA-0000410-2012

BEFORE: BOWES, LAZARUS and COLVILLE*, JJ.

MEMORANDUM BY COLVILLE, J.:

Filed: March 19, 2013

This is a *pro se* appeal from the judgment of sentence imposed following Appellant's convictions of Motor Vehicle Code violations, including 75 Pa.C.S.A. § 1501(a), Drivers required to be licensed.¹

Pennsylvania Rule of Appellate Procedure 2101 dictates that appellate briefs must conform, in all material respects, to the requirements of the

¹ It appears that Appellant is wary of the application process to obtain a driver's license because he does not wish to divulge his Social Security number. We suggest that Appellant make an application to the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, Bureau of Driver Licensing, for permission to utilize an alternative procedure through which he would not have to divulge that information.

* Retired Senior Judge assigned to the Superior Court.

Rules of Appellate Procedure. Appellant's *pro se* appellate brief soundly fails to do so. For instance, the brief specifies no issue for our review, in violation of Pa.R.A.P. 2116(a).

Nonetheless, a generous reading of the brief permits us to discern one essential theory presented therein: a claim that driving is a right. To the extent Appellant is requesting relief from his conviction of 75 Pa.C.S.A. § 1501(a) on this basis, this argument has been rejected by our Supreme Court. The Supreme Court has held that driving is not a right, but instead is a privilege which may be enjoyed only by those who comply with the requirements of the laws related thereto. ***Alexander v. DOT, Bureau of Driver Licensing***, 880 A.2d 552, 561 (Pa. 2005).

Accordingly, Appellant has failed to establish that he is entitled to appellate relief.

Judgment of sentence affirmed.