
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.

KEVIN L. STROBEL v. ROSE LI-HWA STROBEL
(AC 24227)

Foti, Schaller and Bishop, Js.

Argued April 30—officially released July 6, 2004

(Appeal from Superior Court, judicial district of
Fairfield, Steinberg, J.; Abery-Wetstone, J.)

Rose Li-Hwa Strobel, pro se, the appellant
(defendant).

Kevin L. Strobel, pro se, the appellee (plaintiff).

Opinion

PER CURIAM. In this marital dissolution matter, the pro se defendant, Rose Li-Hwa Strobel, appeals from postjudgment orders issued by the court on May 5 and June 25, 2003, in connection with the dissolution of her marriage to the plaintiff, Kevin L. Strobel. On appeal, the defendant assails the court's factual findings and asserts that the court abused its discretion in the various orders it entered. The defendant's brief, however, is entirely devoid of any legal argument or reasoning. Although it is our policy to give leeway to pro se litigants regarding their adherence to the rules of this court, we are not willing to abide a complete disregard for the orderly presentation of issues on appeal. See *Rosato v. Rosato*, 53 Conn. App. 387, 390, 731 A.2d 323 (1999) (liberal policy afforded pro se litigants does not afford them license to disregard relevant rules of procedural and substantive law). In her rehashing of the factual issues that have beset these parties and their minor child, the defendant has not provided any basis for reversal of any of the court's orders.

The judgment is affirmed.
