NON-PRECEDENTIAL DECISION - SEE SUPERIOR COURT O.P. 65.37

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA	:	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA
v.	:	
DAWN MARIE WESTON	:	
Appellant	:	No. 678 EDA 2026

Appeal from the Judgment of Sentence Entered February 6, 2026
In the Court of Common Pleas of Pike County Criminal Division at No(s): CP-52-SA-0000038-2025

BEFORE: BOWES, J., KING, J., and LANE, J.

MEMORANDUM BY LANE, J.: **FILED NOVEMBER 10, 2026**

Dawn Marie Weston ("Weston") appeals *pro se* from the judgment of sentence imposed following her summary conviction for harassment.[1] We dismiss the appeal.

Given our disposition, a detailed recitation of the factual and procedural history of this matter is unnecessary. Instead, we briefly note that the record reflects the following. In 2025, Weston was convicted of the summary offense of harassment. Weston appealed the summary conviction to the court of common pleas, which conducted a non-jury trial *de novo* on February 6, 2026. On that same date, the trial court entered an order in which it found Weston guilty of harassment and imposed a fine and court costs. Weston then filed a timely notice of appeal. The trial court did not order Weston to file a concise

---

[1] ***See*** 18 Pa.C.S.A. § 2709(a)(3).

statement of errors complained of on appeal pursuant to Pa.R.A.P. 1925(b); however, the court authored an opinion pursuant to Rule 1925(a).

Preliminarily, we must address the significant deficiencies in Weston's appellate brief. Appellate briefs must conform materially to the requirements of the Pennsylvania Rules of Appellate Procedure, and this Court may quash or dismiss an appeal if the defects in the brief are substantial. ***See Commonwealth v. Tchirkow***, 160 A.3d 798, 804 (Pa. Super. 2017); ***see also*** Pa.R.A.P. 2101 (providing that, if the appellant's brief fails to conform with the rules of appellate procedure in all material respects, the appeal may be quashed or dismissed).

Pennsylvania Rule of Appellate Procedure 2111(a) provides that the brief of the appellant shall consist of, *inter alia*, the following matters, separately and distinctly entitled:

(1) Statement of jurisdiction.

(2) Order or other determination in question.

(3) Statement of both the scope of review and the standard of

(4) Statement of the questions involved.

(5) Statement of the case.

(6) Summary of argument.

* * * *

(8) Argument for appellant.

Pa.R.A.P. 2111(a). The appellant must also append to the brief a copy of any opinion prepared by the trial court relating to the order or other determination under review, as well as a copy of the concise statement. ***See*** Pa.R.A.P. 2111(b), (d). If the trial court has not entered an order directing the filing of a concise statement pursuant to Rule 1925(b), the brief shall contain an averment that no order to file a statement of errors complained of on appeal was entered by the trial court. ***See*** Pa.R.A.P. 2111(d).

Here, Weston's *pro se* appellate brief does not comply with the mandates of Rule 2111. Her brief does not include a statement of jurisdiction. ***See*** Pa.R.A.P. 2111(a)(1); ***see also*** Pa.R.A.P. 2114 (requiring the statement of jurisdiction to "contain a precise citation to the statutory provision, general rule or other authority believed to confer on the appellate court jurisdiction to review the order or other determination in question"). The brief does not identify the order or other determination that Weston seeks to challenge. ***See*** Pa.R.A.P. 2111(a)(2); ***see also*** Pa.R.A.P. 2115 (providing that "the text of the order or other determination from which an appeal has been taken or which is otherwise sought to be reviewed shall be set forth verbatim immediately following the statement of jurisdiction"). The brief does not provide either the scope of review or the standard of review that this Court must apply in relation to the issue(s) raised for appellate review. ***See*** Pa.R.A.P. 2111(a)(3). The brief does not include a conforming statement of the case. Although the brief provides a history of the case, Weston has failed

to include any references to the places in the record where the evidence substantiating the facts relied upon may be found. ***See*** Pa.R.A.P. 2111(a)(5); ***see also*** Pa.R.A.P. 2117. The brief does not include a summary of the argument, providing a concise, but accurate, summary of the arguments presented in support of the issues raised. ***See*** Pa.R.A.P. 2111(a)(6); ***see also*** Pa.R.A.P. 2118. Weston also failed to append to her brief a copy of the Rule 1925(a) opinion prepared by the trial court, and she failed to indicate that the trial court did not enter a Rule 1925(b) order directing her to file a concise statement. ***See*** Pa.R.A.P. 2111(b), (d).

With respect to the argument section of Weston's brief, this Court has explained:

> When briefing the various issues that have been preserved, it is an appellant's duty to present arguments that are sufficiently developed for our review. The brief must support the claims with pertinent discussion, with references to the record and with citations to legal authorities. Citations to authorities must articulate the principles for which they are cited.
>
> This Court will not act as counsel and will not develop arguments on behalf of an appellant. Moreover, when defects in a brief impede our ability to conduct meaningful appellate review, we may dismiss the appeal entirely or find certain issues to be waived.

Commonwealth v. Hardy, 918 A.2d 766, 771 (Pa. Super. 2007) (citations omitted); ***see also*** Pa.R.A.P. 2119(a) (stating that the argument shall be divided into as many sections as there are questions presented, followed by discussion with citation to relevant legal authority).

In her brief, Weston does not designate any section as the "argument" section of her brief. While Weston purports to make legal assertions, she does not cite to any supporting legal authority for those assertions. Indeed, throughout her entire brief, Weston does not cite any statute or case law.

In sum, Weston's arguments are underdeveloped and lack meaningful legal analysis. She has not provided this Court with any pertinent legal discussion regarding the conviction and judgment of sentence that she purports to appeal. Given the significant briefing deficiencies which prevent meaningful appellate review of this matter, we are constrained to dismiss the appeal.[2]

Appeal dismissed.

Judgment Entered.

Benjamin D. Kohler

Benjamin D. Kohler, Esq.
Prothonotary

Date: 11/10/2026

---

[2] We are mindful that Weston is proceeding *pro se*. However, "although this Court is willing to construe liberally materials filed by a *pro se* litigant, *pro se* status generally confers no special benefit upon an appellant." ***Commonwealth v. Lyons***, 833 A.2d 245, 251-52 (Pa. Super. 2003) (citation omitted). "Accordingly, a *pro se* litigant must comply with the procedural rules set forth in the Pennsylvania Rules of the Court." ***Id***. This Court "cannot be expected to become a litigant's counsel or find more in a written *pro se* submission than is fairly conveyed." ***Commonwealth v. Blakeney***, 108 A.3d 739, 766 (Pa. 2014).