
The “officially released” date that appears near the beginning of each opinion is the date the opinion will be published in the Connecticut Law Journal or the date it was released as a slip opinion. The operative date for the beginning of all time periods for filing postopinion motions and petitions for certification is the “officially released” date appearing in the opinion. In no event will any such motions be accepted before the “officially released” date.

All opinions are subject to modification and technical correction prior to official publication in the Connecticut Reports and Connecticut Appellate Reports. In the event of discrepancies between the electronic version of an opinion and the print version appearing in the Connecticut Law Journal and subsequently in the Connecticut Reports or Connecticut Appellate Reports, the latest print version is to be considered authoritative.

The syllabus and procedural history accompanying the opinion as it appears on the Commission on Official Legal Publications Electronic Bulletin Board Service and in the Connecticut Law Journal and bound volumes of official reports are copyrighted by the Secretary of the State, State of Connecticut, and may not be reproduced and distributed without the express written permission of the Commission on Official Legal Publications, Judicial Branch, State of Connecticut.

MARIANNE HOWATSON *v.* RICHARD FRIEDBERG
(AC 32886)

Lavine, Espinosa and West, Js.

Argued March 14—officially released April 24, 2012

(Appeal from Superior Court, judicial district of
Stamford-Norwalk, Malone, J.)

Richard Friedberg, pro se, the appellant (defendant).

Gary I. Cohen, for the appellee (plaintiff).

PER CURIAM. The self-represented defendant, Richard Friedberg, appeals from the judgment of the trial court dissolving his marriage to the plaintiff, Marianne Howatson. At points in his brief, the defendant asserts that the court abused its discretion, the evidence does not support the court's financial awards and the court was biased against him. The defendant, however, provided no legal analysis to support those assertions. We therefore deem any claim the defendant sought to present to this court abandoned. See *Duve v. Duve*, 25 Conn. App. 262, 264, 594 A.2d 473, ("claim was neither factually developed, nor supported by case citations"), cert. denied, 220 Conn. 911, 597 A.2d 332 (1991), cert. denied, 502 U.S. 1114, 112 S. Ct. 1224, 117 L. Ed. 2d 460 (1992).

"[T]he right of self-representation provides no attendant license not to comply with relevant rules of procedural and substantive law." (Internal quotation marks omitted.) *Id.* It is well settled that appellate courts "are not required to review claims that are inadequately briefed. . . . We consistently have held that [a]nalysis, rather than mere abstract assertion, is required in order to avoid abandoning an issue by failure to brief the issue properly. . . . [F]or this court judiciously and efficiently to consider claims of error raised on appeal . . . the parties must clearly and fully set forth their arguments in their briefs. We do not reverse the judgment of a trial court on the basis of challenges to its rulings that have not been adequately briefed." (Internal quotation marks omitted.) *Keating v. Ferrandino*, 125 Conn. App. 601, 603, 10 A.3d 59 (2010).

The judgment is affirmed.
