IN THE COMMONWEALTH COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Jesse Snak,	:	
Petitioner	:	
	:	
v.	:	No. 1372 C.D. 2025
	:	SUBMITTED: October 13, 2026
Unemployment Compensation	:	
Board of Review,	:	
Respondent	:	

BEFORE: HONORABLE RENÉE COHN JUBELIRER, President Judge
HONORABLE CHRISTINE FIZZANO CANNON, Judge (P.)
HONORABLE BONNIE BRIGANCE LEADBETTER, Senior Judge

OPINION NOT REPORTED

MEMORANDUM OPINION BY
SENIOR JUDGE LEADBETTER **FILED: November 18, 2026**

Jesse Snak, Petitioner (Claimant), appeals from the order of the Unemployment Compensation Board of Review, Respondent, affirming the decision of the Referee and quashing his appeal. Because Petitioner fails to develop any argument in his brief, thereby precluding effective appellate review, we affirm.

The facts of the case are as follows. Claimant filed an application for unemployment compensation with the Department of Labor and Industry on January 7, 2025, effective January 5, 2025.[1] On January 7, 2025, the Department's Office of Unemployment Compensation Benefits issued a notice of financial determination finding that Claimant was ineligible because he "d[id] not have enough wages in [his] base year to qualify for benefits," between October 1, 2023 and September 30,

[1] In his brief, Claimant states without citation that his application was filed on December 31, 2024, and that the Department "improperly started the claim on January 5, 2025. This is contrary to the record." *See* Suppl. Record at 3.

2024.[2] Claimant appealed from the determination, disputing the effective date of his claim and the calculation of the base year. Certified Record "C.R." at 29. The Referee issued a decision finding that Claimant did not dispute the earnings or credit weeks in his base year, noting that "backdating is a separate and distinct issue from financial eligibility on the claim" and stating that Claimant might wish to follow up with the Service Center to request backdating if he believed he was eligible. C.R. at 35. Because "the information provided on appeal is not relevant to the [m]onetary [d]etermination . . . and no practical purpose will be served by proceeding with this appeal relevant to the monetary determination," the Referee quashed the appeal. *Id.*

Claimant appealed the Referee's decision to the Board, "disputing the earnings or credit weeks of his base year." *Id.* at 47. The Board remanded the matter to the Referee to serve as hearing officer for the purpose of "reopen[ing] the record in order to permit the [C]laimant to provide evidence and testimony for the record regarding the merits of his challenge to the [m]onetary [d]etermination issued by the Department . . . ." *Id.* at 81. The Board stated that Claimant might have "intended to challenge the determination and might not have intended to request backdating as the Referee concluded." *Id.*

Upon remand to the Referee, Claimant failed to appear at the scheduled hearing, and the Board entered its order affirming the Referee's decision and quashing Claimant's appeal. The Board stated that "[b]ecause [] Claimant did not appear at the remand hearing and did not offer any testimony for the record, the

[2] In its brief, the Board explains that Claimant was denied benefits because he earned 100% of his wages ($13,039) from employment within a single quarter of the base year (between October 1, 2023 and December 31, 2023). Under Section 401(a)(2) of the Unemployment Compensation Law, claimants must earn at least 37% of their base year wages outside of the highest-earning quarter to qualify for benefits. Section 401(a)(2) of Act of Dec. 5, 1936, Second Ex. Sess., P.L. (1937) 2897, *as amended*, 43 P.S. § 801(a)(2).

Board has no basis to disturb the Referee's decision that quashed the claimant's appeal. Therefore, in giving consideration to the entire record . . . , the Board concludes that the determination made by the Referee . . . is proper under the . . . [] Unemployment Compensation Law." *Id.* at 130. The Board adopted and incorporated the Referee's findings and conclusions, i.e., that Claimant did not dispute the earnings or credit weeks in his base year.

On appeal, Claimant lists six numbered issues in his statement of questions presented,[3] but presents essentially no argument.[4] The brief continues what argument is made into the conclusion but does not address the issues listed.[5]

---

[3] Claimant lists the following issues:

> 1. Did the Board err in ruling that the Referee's decision should be affirmed?
> . . . .
> 2. Did the Board err in ruling Petitioner was ineligible for benefits?
> . . . .
> 3. Did the Board err in ruling this was not an appeal involving Financial Determination?
> . . . .
> 4. Did the Board err in ruling Petitioner was ineligible for benefits by establishing a base year September 2024 - October 2023?
> . . . .
> 5. Did the Board err in ruling Petitioner was ineligible for benefits for establishing a Claim Effective Date January 5 2025?
> . . . .
> 6. Did the Board err in ruling determining December 29 2024 as a backdating request?

Claimant's Br. at 5.

[4] The summary of argument and argument both consist of a single sentence: "On December 31, 2024, Petitioner filed an initial Application for Unemployment Compensation Benefits." Claimant's Br. at 9-10.

[5] The conclusion contains the following text:

(Footnote continued on next page…)

While we generally construe *pro se* filings liberally, *see Means v. Housing Authority of Pittsburgh*, 747 A.2d 1286, 1289 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2000), the argument portion of a brief must still be developed with pertinent discussion of the issues, including citations to relevant authority, Rule 2119(a) of the Pennsylvania Rules of Appellate Procedure, Pa. R.A.P. 2119(a). When parties fail to satisfy this requirement, the Court is neither obliged, nor even particularly equipped, to develop an argument for them; moreover, to do so places the Court in the conflicting roles of advocate and neutral arbiter. *C.M. v. Pa. State Police*, 269 A.3d 1280, 1285 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2022). A party's failure to adhere to Rule 2119 and properly develop an argument may result in waiver. *City of Phila. v. Workers' Comp. Appeal Bd. (Calderazzo)*, 968 A.2d 841, 846 n.4 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2009).

Petitioner's brief does not develop a cognizable argument, i.e., provide a rationale in support of reversal. To the extent he makes an argument, he does not

---

> The instructions that came with the letter of Determination instructed that a Wage Protest can be filed or a Formal Appeal. Not and or. Only or. Meaning one.
>
> The instructions additionally go on to instruct, that Wage Protest are limited to Financial Determinations only and if there are other issues or eligibility issues the Formal Appeal is the instructed instrument of use.
>
> A Wage Protest is an informal internal request, where a Formal Appeal is a formal part of the appellate process, regulated by the Pennsylvania statutes.
>
> Petitioner is entitled to benefits. The current Financial Determination Base Year should not stand. Petitioner should be made eligible. The Referee s Decision dated May 27, 2025, and the Boards Decision dated September 17, 2025 should be REVERSED and Petitioner's appeal should be GRANTED.

Claimant's Br. at 11.

identify legal authority and a right to relief, hindering meaningful appellate review. We are thus constrained to find that he has waived any argument.[6]

Accordingly, the Board's final order is affirmed.

BONNIE BRIGANCE LEADBETTER,
President Judge Emerita

[6] Even if Claimant had not waived all arguments, we would affirm the Board based on Claimant's having not appeared at the remand hearing to present evidence necessary to meet the burden of proving financial eligibility.

IN THE COMMONWEALTH COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Jesse Snak,	:	
Petitioner	:	
	:	
v.	:	No. 1372 C.D. 2025
	:	
Unemployment Compensation Board of Review,	:	
Respondent	:	

O R D E R

AND NOW, this 18th day of November, 2026, the Order of the Unemployment Compensation Board of Review is AFFIRMED.

BONNIE BRIGANCE LEADBETTER,
President Judge Emerita