

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

ENTRY ORDER

SUPREME COURT DOCKET NO. 2002-055

AUGUST TERM, 2002

Mary Kelley

v.

Jefferey A. Stone

}
}
}
}
}
}
}
}
}
}

APPEALED FROM:

Windsor Family Court

DOCKET NO.

Trial Judge: Martha M. Davis

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

Defendant Jefferey Stone, acting pro se, is apparently appealing from the family court's order extending a final relief-from-abuse order. Although we give leeway to pro se litigants with respect to meeting briefing requirements, see Beyel v. Degan, 142 Vt. 617, 619 (1983), in this case we must affirm the underlying order because defendant has failed to present a statement of issues for review or even indicate how the family court erred in issuing the challenged order. See V.R.A.P. 28(a) (setting forth briefing requirements for appellants). In short, there is no claim of error for us to consider. To the extent that defendant is challenging the sufficiency of the evidence by suggesting that complainant had ulterior motives in seeking an extension of the relief-from-abuse order, he fails to make any reference to the record indicating that the evidence was insufficient to support the order.

Affirmed.

BY THE COURT:

Jeffrey L. Amestoy, Chief Justice

James L. Morse, Associate Justice

Marilyn S. Skoglund, Associate Justice