

IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

-----ooOoo-----

State of Utah,	)	MEMORANDUM DECISION
	)	(Not For Official Publication)
Plaintiff and Appellee,	)	
	)	Case No. 20081059-CA
v.	)	
	)	F I L E D
Dale N. Stevens,	)	(June 17, 2010)
	)	
Defendant and Appellant.	)	<span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">2010 UT App 159</span>

-----

Eighth District, Vernal Department, 071800559  
The Honorable A. Lynn Payne

Attorneys: Dale N. Stevens, Vernal, Appellant Pro Se  
Mark L. Shurtleff and Laura B. Dupaix, Salt Lake  
City, for Appellee

-----

Before Judges Davis, McHugh, and Orme.

PER CURIAM:

Dale N. Stevens appeals his December 9, 2008 convictions for second degree burglary and attempted lewdness involving a child. We affirm.

Rule 24(a) of the Utah Rules of Appellate Procedure requires, among other things, that all appellate briefs submitted must contain a table of contents; a table of authorities; a statement of jurisdiction; a statement of the issues presented for appeal, including the standard of appellate review with supporting authority; and proper citations to the record. See Utah R. App. P. 24(a). Rule 24(a)(9) also requires that all appellate briefs contain proper legal analysis with citations to relevant legal authority supporting the arguments raised therein. See id. R. 24(a)(9).

An appellate court is not a depository in which parties may dump the burden of their argument and research. See Smith v. Four Corners Mental Health Ctr., Inc., 2003 UT 23, ¶ 46, 70 P.3d 904. Although Utah appellate courts are reluctant to penalize self-represented litigants for technical rule violations, an appellate court will not assume a party's burden of argument and research. See Allen v. Friel, 2008 UT 56, ¶ 9, 194 P.3d 903.

The Utah Supreme Court has expressly stated that "[o]ur rules of appellate procedure clearly set forth the requirements that appellants and appellees must meet when submitting briefs." MacKay v. Hardy, 973 P.2d 941, 947 (Utah 1998). When a party fails to meet the briefing requirements set forth in rule 24 of the Utah Rules of Appellate Procedure, an appellate court may properly decline to address the arguments raised therein and may summarily affirm the district court. See id. at 948.

Stevens declined to accept appointed counsel and requested to proceed with his appeal on his own behalf. This court specifically notified Stevens that the document that he filed as his original brief failed to meet the briefing requirements of rule 24, and that this court may decline to address his arguments if he did not file an appropriate brief. Stevens was given the opportunity to file a brief that complied with rule 24. Despite this court's request, Stevens declined to file a proper brief. Stevens's brief is wholly deficient and utterly fails to comply with the requirements of rule 24. Because Stevens's brief fails to set forth any legal argument which, if well-taken, would entitle him to reversal of his convictions, this court is compelled to affirm the district court's order.

Affirmed.

---

James Z. Davis,  
Presiding Judge

---

Carolyn B. McHugh,  
Associate Presiding Judge

---

Gregory K. Orme, Judge