

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

ENTRY ORDER

SUPREME COURT DOCKET NO. 2002-461

MAY TERM, 2003

	}	APPEALED FROM:
	}	
State of Vermont	}	District Court of Vermont, Unit No. 2,
	}	Rutland Circuit
v.	}	
	}	
Thomas H. Millington	}	DOCKET No. 188-1-02 RdCr
	}	
	}	Trial Judge: Nancy Corsones
	}	

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

Defendant Thomas H. Millington appeals pro se from his conviction of attempting to elude a police officer. He argues that: (1) the arresting officer made " unconstitutional demands" of him and requested " unconstitutional papers" ; (2) the officer has been charged with abusing another officer; (3) defendant had to flee the scene to protect himself; (4) the trial court is corrupt; (5) the judgment is void due to obstruction of justice; and (6) defendant has been repeatedly subject to " hate crimes." We affirm.

In December 2001, a police officer observed defendant driving a vehicle with an inoperative left rear taillight. The officer signaled for defendant to pull over, which he did. The officer then asked defendant for his license, registration, and proof of insurance. Defendant refused to provide this information, but gave the officer his name and date of birth. When the officer returned to his vehicle to obtain additional information, defendant drove away. The officer followed defendant with his siren operating and blue lights flashing. Defendant eventually pulled into the driveway of a residence over four miles away. He was then charged with attempting to elude a police officer. After a trial, a jury convicted him of the charge. This appeal followed.

Defendant' s arguments on appeal are inadequately briefed. He offers no record support for his claimed errors, nor does he identify any errors that would justify the reversal of his conviction. See V.R.A.P. 28(a)(4); In re S.B.L., 150 Vt. 294, 297 (1988) (party seeking appellate review of alleged errors by trial court bears burden of demonstrating those errors). Defendant' s arguments do not warrant consideration by the Court, and we therefore do not address them. See Johnson v. Johnson, 158 Vt. 160, 164 n * (1992).

Affirmed.

BY THE COURT:

Denise R. Johnson, Associate Justice

Marilyn S. Skoglund, Associate Justice

Frederic W. Allen, Chief Justice (Ret.)

Specially Assigned