

IN THE  
**ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS**  
DIVISION TWO

---

MELINDA GABRIELLA VALENZUELA,  
*Plaintiff/Appellant,*

*v.*

CURTIS BIVENS,  
*Defendant/Appellee.*

No. 2 CA-CV 2016-0171  
Filed March 16, 2017

---

THIS DECISION DOES NOT CREATE LEGAL PRECEDENT AND  
MAY NOT BE CITED EXCEPT AS AUTHORIZED BY APPLICABLE RULES.  
NOT FOR PUBLICATION  
*See Ariz. R. Sup. Ct. 111(c)(1); Ariz. R. Civ. App. P. 28(a)(1), (f).*

---

Appeal from the Superior Court in Pinal County  
No. S1100CV201501459  
The Honorable Stephen F. McCarville, Judge

**APPEAL DISMISSED**

---

Melinda Gabriella Valenzuela, Buckeye  
*In Propria Persona*

---

**MEMORANDUM DECISION**

Chief Judge Eckerstrom authored the decision of the Court, in which  
Presiding Judge Howard and Judge Vásquez concurred.

---

VALENZUELA v. BIVENS  
Decision of the Court

E C K E R S T R O M, Chief Judge:

¶1 Appellant Melinda Valenzuela, who represents herself in this appeal, challenges a judgment dismissing without prejudice her complaint against appellee Curtis Bivens. An appellant has a duty to identify the jurisdictional basis of an appeal under Rule 13(a)(4), Ariz. R. Civ. App. P. “We, in turn, have an independent duty to confirm our jurisdiction over the appeal before us.” *Anderson v. Valley Union High Sch., Dist. No. 22*, 229 Ariz. 52, ¶ 2, 270 P.3d 879, 881 (App. 2012).

¶2 “A dismissal without prejudice is not a final judgment and is therefore generally not appealable.” *Canyon Ambulatory Surgery Ctr. v. SCF Ariz.*, 225 Ariz. 414, ¶ 14, 239 P.3d 733, 737-38 (App. 2010). In her opening brief, Valenzuela fails to specify the basis of this court’s appellate jurisdiction and explain why, in this particular case, the “dismissal . . . without prejudice is appealable.” *Id.* Her brief fails to provide any relevant “citations of legal authorities and . . . references to the . . . record.” Ariz. R. Civ. App. P. 13(a)(7)(A). It is not incumbent on this court to develop legal arguments and discharge a party’s obligations. *See Ace Auto. Prods., Inc. v. Van Duyne*, 156 Ariz. 140, 143, 750 P.2d 898, 901 (App. 1987). Parties who represent themselves are held to the same standards as attorneys in terms of complying with procedural rules. *In re Marriage of Williams*, 219 Ariz. 546, ¶ 13, 200 P.3d 1043, 1046 (App. 2008).

¶3 Given Valenzuela’s failure to establish appellate jurisdiction, the appeal is dismissed.