

*Note: Decisions of a three-justice panel are not to be considered as precedent before any tribunal.*

**ENTRY ORDER**

SUPREME COURT DOCKET NO. 2003-314

AUGUST TERM, 2004

	}	APPEALED FROM:
	}	
Carol Skumautz and Alan	}	Windsor Superior Court
Skumautz	}	
	}	
v.	}	DOCKET NOS. 396-9-00, 110-3-01Wrc
	}	
Horseshore Acres, Inc., Gary B.	}	Trial Judge: Alan W. Cook
Hale and Lyn Rae Hale	}	
	}	
	}	

In the above-entitled cause, the Clerk will enter:

Plaintiffs appeal the superior court= s judgment in favor of defendants with respect to plaintiffs= claims alleging that defendants wrongfully evicted them from a family campground. We affirm.

Plaintiff Carol Skumautz is the mother of plaintiff Alan Skumautz, who is learning disabled. Defendants Gary and Lyn Rae Hale are the owners and operators of defendant Horseshoe Acres, Inc., a family campground. Plaintiffs were longtime summer residents of the campground. Toward the end of the 1999 season, issues arose concerning Alan being unsupervised at plaintiffs= campsite. Those issues resurfaced during the 2000 season, at which time Alan was eighteen years old. When the problems could not be worked out, defendants evicted plaintiffs from the campground. Plaintiffs sued, alleging violations of the Residential Rental Agreements Act, the Mobile Home Park Act, and the Consumer Fraud Act, as well as raising claims of unfair housing practices and discrimination in the operation of a public accommodation. Some of the counts were dismissed before trial, which was held over three days in February 2003. Following the bench trial, the superior court found in favor of defendants on all of plaintiffs= claims. After considering the testimony on both sides, the court found that Carol had agreed to supervise her son at the campsite but failed to do so and further failed to address problems arising from Alan= s unsupervised conduct. The court concluded that plaintiffs had failed to present any credible evidence of discriminatory conduct or a violation of any law on the part of defendants.

On appeal, plaintiffs have filed a two-page letter stating, without any citations to the record or legal authorities, that they were illegally evicted, and that they were not given a chance to rebut those accusing Alan of inappropriate behavior. Plaintiffs contend that they were unable to rebut accusations against Alan because some of the people who were ordered to give depositions never did so. The trial court docket entries reflect, however, that the subpoenas were voluntarily withdrawn by plaintiffs= counsel after motions to quash were filed. Nothing in the record indicates that the court committed any error with respect to what witnesses appeared at trial. In short, plaintiffs neither contest any of the specific findings or conclusions in the trial court=s twenty-eight-page opinion, nor state any legal basis to challenge the court= s decision regarding their claims. Accordingly, we find no basis for overturning the trial court= s judgment. See New England P= ship, Inc. v. Rutland City Sch. Dist., 173 Vt. 69, 73 (2001) (Supreme Court is not required to undertake search for claimed error not adequately briefed, supported by argument, or pointed out in record).

Affirmed.

BY THE COURT:

---

John A. Dooley, Associate Justice

---

Denise R. Johnson, Associate Justice

---

Marilyn S. Skoglund, Associate Justice