

An unpublished opinion of the North Carolina Court of Appeals does not constitute controlling legal authority. Citation is disfavored, but may be permitted in accordance with the provisions of Rule 30(e)(3) of the North Carolina Rules of Appellate Procedure. Rule

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF NORTH CAROLINA

No. COA25-1202

Filed 19 August 2026

Guilford County, No. 21 CVD 002949-400

JOY PETERSON, Plaintiff,

v.

ROGER PETERSON, Defendant.

Appeal by defendant from order entered 22 May 2025 by Judge Gordon A. Miller in Guilford County District Court. Heard in the Court of Appeals 4 August 2026.

Roger Peterson, pro se, defendant-appellant.

No brief filed for plaintiff-appellee.

PER CURIAM.

Roger Peterson (“Defendant”) appeals following the trial court’s equitable distribution order entered subsequent to denial of his Rule 60 motion. We dismiss.

I. Jurisdiction

This Court possesses jurisdiction pursuant to N.C. Gen. Stat. § 7A-27(b)(1) (2025).

II. Background

Defendant's brief asserts: "Defendant-Appellant is not a lawyer, does not have expertise or resources to research Statutes and other Authorities. Defendant-Appellant should not be penalized and should receive fairness of law." Defendant's filing and argument merely asserts and contains excerpts from the trial transcript and his personal opinion about the purported issue on appeal and is devoid of any legal authority, reasoning, or analysis.

Other than one reference to the 14th Amendment and a non-applicable criminal statute, Defendant's brief also fails to provide any legal authority in support of his argument. "[D]efendant points to absolutely no legal authority in support of his contention. He entirely fails to set forth the relevant standard of review and legal authority for determining whether the [issue on appeal] constitutes error." *Comstock v. Comstock*, 240 N.C. App. 304, 309, 771 S.E.2d. 602, 607 (2015).

III. Analysis

Rule 28(b)(6) of our Rules of Appellate Procedure provides, "[t]he body of the argument . . . *shall* contain citations of the authorities upon which the appellant relies." (emphasis supplied) "The Rules of Appellate Procedure are mandatory [and] failure to comply with [the] rules subjects an appeal to dismissal." *Bledsoe v. Cnty. of Wilkes*, 135 N.C. App. 124, 125, 519 S.E.2d. 316, 317 (1999) (per curiam) (citation

omitted). “Furthermore, these rules apply to everyone—whether acting *pro se* or being represented by all of the five largest law firms in the state.” *Id.*

In light of this, and in order to review this appeal, this panel would have to research and create legal arguments on Defendant’s behalf, a result that is prohibited by our Supreme Court in *Viar v. N.C. Dep’t of Transp.*, 359 N.C. 400, 402, 610 S.E.2d 360, 361 (2005) (“It is not the role of the appellate courts . . . to create an appeal for an appellant.”).

This Court has “routinely held an argument to be abandoned where an appellant presents argument without such authority and in contravention of the rule.” *K2HN Constr. NC, LLC v. Five D Contractors, Inc.*, 267 N.C. App. 207, 213, 832 S.E.2d 559, 564 (2019).

Here, Defendant failed to argue, cite, or include authorities upon which his purported arguments might rely. “Issues not presented in a party’s brief, or in support of which no reason or argument is stated, *will be abandoned.*” N.C. R. App. 28(b)(6) (emphasis supplied). All unsupported arguments purportedly raised are abandoned. *Id.*

IV. Conclusion

Although this Court recognizes the challenges a *pro se* appellant may encounter when navigating the rules and procedures of our legal system, it remains the standard that “*pro se* appellants must adhere strictly to the Rules of Appellate Procedure.” *Strauss v. Hunt*, 140 N.C. App. 345, 348-49, 536 S.E.2d 636, 639 (2000);

PETERSON V. PETERSON

Opinion of the Court

see also Guerra v. Harbor Freight Tools, 287 N.C. App. 634, 639-40, 884 S.E.2d 74, 78 (2023). “Failure to follow these rules will subject an appeal to dismissal.” *Viar*, 359 N.C. at 401, 610 S.E.2d at 360 (quoting *Steingrass v. Steingrass*, 350 N.C. 64, 65, 511 S.E.2d 298, 299 (1999)). Due to Defendant’s failure to comply with Rule 28(b)(6), and the other Rules of Appellate Procedure, we dismiss his appeal.

DISMISSED.

Panel consisting of Judges Stroud, Tyson, and Murry.

Report per Rule 30(e).