

AFFIRMED and Opinion Filed October 29, 2019



**In The
Court of Appeals
Fifth District of Texas at Dallas**

No. 05-18-00754-CV

**LOUELLA CLANTON, Appellant
V.
MARKOSE K. MARKOSE, Appellee**

**On Appeal from the County Court at Law No. 1
Dallas County, Texas
Trial Court Cause No. CC-18-00664-A**

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Before Justices Burns, Whitehill, and Schenck
Opinion by Justice Whitehill

Louella Clanton, pro se, appeals from the county court's agreed judgment awarding Markose Markose possession of rental property, damages, and attorney's fees. As discussed below, we affirm the trial court's judgment.

I. BACKGROUND

The record reflects that Markose filed an eviction suit and the Justice Court entered a judgment awarding him possession and rent. Clanton appealed that judgment to the County Court. There, counsel was appointed for Clanton.

An agreed judgment was subsequently entered in the County Court. That agreed judgment, signed by counsel for both parties and approved on the record, awards Markose possession of the property at issue, \$748.50 in damages, and \$1,500.00 in attorney's fees. Clanton appeals from that agreed judgment.

II. ANALYSIS

We previously granted Clanton's motion for extension of time to remedy her untimely notice of appeal and subsequently granted an extension of time to file a brief. We then instructed her to file an amended brief to correct deficiencies and granted her motion for an extension of time to file her amended brief. That amended brief is now before the court.

Initially, we note that a pro se litigant is held to the same standards as licensed attorneys and must comply with applicable laws and rules of procedure. *Mansfield State Bank v. Cohn*, 573 S.W.2d 181, 184–85 (Tex.1978). On appeal, as at trial, the pro se appellant must properly present its case. *Id.*; *Strange v. Continental Cas. Co.*, 126 S.W.3d 676, 678 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2004, pet. denied).

The rules of appellate procedure require an appellant's brief to contain "a clear and concise argument for the contentions made, with appropriate citations to authorities and to the record." TEX. R. APP. P. 38.1(h). An issue on appeal unsupported by argument or citation to any legal authority presents nothing for the court to review. *Birnbaum v. Law Offices of G. David Westfall*, 120 S.W.3d 470, 477 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2003, pet. denied). Similarly, we cannot speculate as to the substance of the specific issues appellant claims we must address. *Strange*, 126 S.W.3d at 678. An appellate court has no duty to perform an independent review of the record and applicable law to determine whether any error occurred. *See id.*

Clanton appears to now claim she did not agree to the agreed judgment and her case should be reinstated.¹ Clanton's amended brief provides us with no argument or citation to any legal authority applicable to setting aside the agreed judgment or citation to the record. In addition, we find no record evidence that would support such resolution. Indeed, the agreed judgment was

¹ To the extent she addresses other complaints, she does not identify any trial court rulings concerning these matters and we have found none. Thus, her discussion of those matters presents nothing for our review. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 38.1(h).

presented to the trial court on the record in open court. Accordingly, we resolve Clanton's issue(s) against her.

The trial court's judgment is affirmed.

/Bill Whitehill/

BILL WHITEHILL
JUSTICE

180754F.P05



**Court of Appeals
Fifth District of Texas at Dallas**

JUDGMENT

LOUELLA CLANTON, Appellant

No. 05-18-00754-CV V.

MARKOSE K. MARKOSE, Appellee

On Appeal from the County Court at Law
No. 1, Dallas County, Texas

Trial Court Cause No. CC-18-00664-A.

Opinion delivered by Justice Whitehill.

Justices Burns and Schenck participating.

In accordance with this Court's opinion of this date, the judgment of the trial court is **AFFIRMED**.

It is **ORDERED** that each party bear its own costs of this appeal.

Judgment entered October 29, 2019.