

IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

-----ooOoo-----

Jennifer Dorado,)	MEMORANDUM DECISION	
)	(Not For Official Publication)	
Petitioner and Appellee,)		
)	Case No. 20100017-CA	
v.)		
)	F I L E D	
Apolinar Dorado,)	(April 15, 2010)	
)		
Respondent and Appellant.)	<table border="1"><tr><td>2010 UT App 95</td></tr></table>	2010 UT App 95
2010 UT App 95			

Fourth District, Provo Department, 084400996
The Honorable Steven L. Hansen

Attorneys: Apolinar Dorado, Elberta, Appellant Pro Se
Matthew G. Morrison and Grant W.P. Morrison, Salt
Lake City, for Appellee

Before Judges Davis, McHugh, and Voros.

PER CURIAM:

Apolinar Dorado appeals the trial court's order denying his motion for a finding of contempt and requiring his visitation with his daughter to be supervised. This is before the court on its own motion for summary disposition based on the lack of a substantial question for review.

In response to the court's motion, Dorado argues facts from his perspective and raises new issues before the appellate court. He asserts that Jennifer Dorado, the physical custodian of his daughter, is unstable and requests that this court grant him custody. These matters were not before the court below. Rather, the hearing regarded supervised visitation and contempt. Generally, this court will not address issues not raised in the trial court. See Hart v. Salt Lake County Comm'n, 945 P.2d 125, 129 (Utah Ct. App. 1997).

Dorado also fails to identify any other specific issue for review. "[A]n appellant must allege the [trial] court committed an error that the appellate court should correct. . . . If an appellant fails to allege specific errors of the [trial] court, the appellate court will not seek out errors in the [trial] court's decision." Allen v. Friel, 2008 UT 56, ¶ 7, 194 P.3d

903. Here, Dorado asserts facts favorable to him but fails to address the trial court's ruling or posture of the case. He does not state a legal issue of trial court error in the ruling. Accordingly, he has failed to present any substantial issue for review warranting further consideration by this court.

Affirmed.¹

James Z. Davis,
Presiding Judge

Carolyn B. McHugh,
Associate Presiding Judge

J. Frederic Voros Jr., Judge

¹Appellee argued in her response to the motion that the order was not a final order and, thus, this court lacked jurisdiction. The order, however, finally determined the contempt matter and therefore was a final appealable order.