
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.

CHARLES E. JELLISON v. PETER B. O'CONNELL,
CONSERVATOR (ESTATE AND PERSON OF
ANN DEVANEY JELLISON)
(AC 22715)

Foti, Schaller and West, Js.

Submitted on briefs September 16—officially released November 12, 2002

(Appeal from Superior Court, judicial district of
Fairfield, Rush, J.)

Charles E. Jellison, pro se, the appellant (plaintiff),
filed a brief.

Daren R. Alteri filed a brief for the appellee
(defendant).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. The pro se plaintiff, Charles E. Jellison, appeals from the trial court's judgment of nonsuit rendered against him. On appeal, the plaintiff apparently claims that the court improperly rendered the judgment of nonsuit.

We decline to review the plaintiff's claim because he has failed to provide any legal authority for or analysis of his claim. "[W]e 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." (Citation omitted; internal quotation marks omitted.) *Wren v. MacPherson Interiors, Inc.*, 69 Conn. App. 349, 359, 794 A.2d 1043 (2002).

"[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. . . . The parties may not merely cite a legal principle without analyzing the relationship between the facts of the case and the law cited. . . . [A]ssignments of error which are merely mentioned but not briefed beyond a statement of the

claim will be deemed abandoned and will not be reviewed by this court. . . . Where the parties cite no law and provide no analysis of their claims, we do not review such claims.” (Internal quotation marks omitted.) *Baris v. Southbend, Inc.*, 68 Conn. App. 546, 550–51, 791 A.2d 713 (2002). We therefore decline to review the plaintiff’s claim and deem it abandoned.

The judgment is affirmed.
