
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.

BONNIE J. LAREAU v. WAYNE M. BURROWS
(AC 25342)

Flynn, McLachlan and West, Js.

Argued June 1—officially released August 16, 2005

(Appeal from Superior Court, judicial district of
Hartford, Langenbach, J.)

Bonnie J. Lareau, pro se, the appellant (plaintiff).

John Kardaras, for the appellee (defendant).

Opinion

FLYNN, J. The pro se plaintiff, Bonnie J. Lareau, appeals from the judgment of the trial court accepting the fact finder's recommendation. The plaintiff alleged in her complaint that she loaned the defendant, Wayne M. Burrows, moneys for several items, including \$5000 so that he could purchase a Frieheffer delivery route. In her prayer for relief, the plaintiff sought more than \$15,000 in damages. On December 15, 2003, and January 12, 2004, the case was heard by Harold M. Levy, attorney trial referee, who, after finding the defendant more credible, recommended judgment in his favor. On March 18, 2004, the court rendered judgment in the defendant's favor in accordance with the findings of fact. The plaintiff makes various claims on appeal, none of which is supported by legal analysis or citation to legal authority.

Although we are solicitous of the fact that the plaintiff is a pro se litigant, "the statutes and rules of practice cannot be ignored completely." (Internal quotation marks omitted.) *Bennings v. Dept. of Correction*, 59 Conn. App. 83, 84, 756 A.2d 289 (2000). "We are not required to review issues that have been improperly presented to this court through an inadequate brief.

. . . Analysis, rather than abstract assertion, is required in order to avoid abandoning an issue by failure to brief the issue properly.” (Internal quotation marks omitted.) *In re Haley B.*, 81 Conn. App. 62, 67–68, 838 A.2d 1006 (2004). “Where a claim is asserted in the statement of issues but thereafter receives only cursory attention in the brief without substantive discussion or citation of authorities, it is deemed to be abandoned.” (Internal quotation marks omitted.) *Cummings v. Twin Tool Mfg. Co.*, 40 Conn. App. 36, 45, 668 A.2d 1346 (1996). Because the plaintiff’s claims are inadequately briefed, we cannot review them.

The judgment is affirmed.

In this opinion the other judges concurred.