
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.

LUBA HILL v. PHILIP BARTELS ET AL.
(AC 22276)

Foti, Schaller and West, Js.

Submitted on briefs September 16—officially released November 19, 2002

(Appeal from Superior Court, judicial district of Stamford-Norwalk, Karazin, Mintz, Js.; Hon. Frank H. D'Andrea, Jr., judge trial referee.)

Luba Hill, pro se, the appellant (plaintiff), filed a brief.

Paul E. Pollock filed a brief for the appellees (defendants).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. The plaintiff, Luba Hill, appeals from the judgment of the trial court rendered after it granted the motion for a nonsuit filed by the defendants, Philip Bartels, the law firm of Holland, Kaufmann and Bartels, and the law firm of Duel and Holland. The plaintiff claims that the court improperly (1) granted the defendants' motion for a nonsuit and (2) overruled her objection to the granting of the motion. We decline to review the plaintiff's claims.

The defendants represented the plaintiff in her divorce proceedings from June, 1992, through January, 1993, when the plaintiff terminated the relationship. In June, 1998, the plaintiff brought an action against them alleging extortion, legal malpractice, breach of the duty of care, intentional infliction of emotional distress, negligence, reckless conduct, abuse of power as an attorney, concealment of theft, misappropriating trust funds, fraud, perjury, mental suffering and violations of the Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act. The defendants thereafter filed a request to have the plaintiff revise her complaint in October, 1998, seeking to have her file a "plain and concise statement of the material facts" alleged. The plaintiff filed her revised complaint, consisting of 455 counts, in November, 1998. The defendants filed a second request to revise in February, 1999, and the plaintiff responded by filing another revised

complaint in March, 1999, consisting of 528 counts. In October, 2000, the defendants filed a third request to revise, to which the plaintiff never responded.

On December 21, 2000, a judgment of dismissal was rendered. The plaintiff subsequently filed a motion to open the judgment of dismissal, which was granted. The defendants then filed a motion for nonsuit, which was granted by the court.

On appeal, the plaintiff claims that the court improperly granted the defendants' motion for a judgment of nonsuit and overruled her objection to the granting of the nonsuit because the defendants' motion was not signed and she never received the defendants' request to revise, which was the basis for the filing of the motion for a judgment of nonsuit. The plaintiff, however, cites no legal authority to support her claims. We decline to address the plaintiff's claims. "[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). "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, 551, 791 A.2d 713 (2002). We decline, therefore, to review the plaintiff's claims and deem them abandoned.

The judgment is affirmed.
