

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

ENTRY ORDER

SUPREME COURT DOCKET NO. 2003-342

MAY TERM, 2004

Patrick Ayer	}	APPEALED FROM:
	}	
	}	Chittenden Superior Court
	}	
v.	}	
	}	DOCKET No. 1625-00 CnC
Libra International Racing, Inc.	}	
	}	Trial Judge: Hon. Matthew I. Katz
	}	
	}	

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

Plaintiff Patrick Ayer appeals pro se from a judgment, based on a jury verdict, in favor of defendant Libra International Racing, Inc. Plaintiff essentially contends the trial court improperly permitted opposing counsel to impugn plaintiff's character and prejudice the jury. We affirm.

In December 2000, plaintiff B through his attorney B filed a complaint against defendant Libra International Racing, Inc., alleging that he had brought his race car to defendant for the purpose of having the steering column and mechanism repaired, that plaintiff picked up the vehicle with the understanding that the repairs had been made, and that he was injured the next day when the steering column came apart, causing him to lose control of the vehicle and strike a tree. Plaintiff alleged that the collision was caused by defendant's negligent work on the car. The defense apparently claimed that the steering mechanism had been installed by plaintiff's own mechanic, that any failure of the mechanism was the result of the accident, and that plaintiff's loss of control was caused by icy road conditions. The case was tried to a jury. Plaintiff was represented by experienced counsel at trial. The jury returned a verdict in favor of defendant after a brief deliberation. The court denied a post-trial motion to amend the judgment or for a new trial.*

Plaintiff's pro se brief on appeal contains a statement of issues describing the appeal as A based on a perception of the character of appellant being portrayed to the jury as a thug and disrespectful@ which made it impossible for the jury A to arrive at an impartial unmolested verdict.@ Plaintiff's one-page argument repeats the claim and asserts further that the trial court erred in allowing the defense to impugn plaintiff's character in a way that prejudiced the jury. Plaintiff also argues, without further elaboration, that the court should not have allowed A the introduction[] of sexual preferences and acceptability.@ Contrary to V.R.A.P. 28(a)(3), plaintiff's brief contains no A specific claims of error, with appropriate references to the record.@ Plaintiff's generalized assertions that the trial court erred in allowing defense counsel to impugn his character, and in permitting the introduction of A sexual preferences,@ are inadequate for purposes of appellate review. Bearing in mind plaintiff's pro se status, it is his burden nevertheless A to demonstrate how the lower court erred warranting reversal. We will not comb the record searching for error.@ In re S.B.L., 150 Vt. 294, 297 (1988). Beyond plaintiff's general assertion that the trial court allowed defendant to engage in improper acts, plaintiff has not specified which evidentiary ruling, if any, was erroneous and has not stated how he preserved the issue for appeal. Accordingly, we must affirm the judgment.

Affirmed.

BY THE COURT:

Jeffrey L. Amestoy, Associate Justice

John A. Dooley, Associate Justice

Denise R. Johnson, Associate Justice