

IN THE
ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

IN RE THE MARRIAGE OF

CRUZ AGUIRRE,
Petitioner/Appellee,

and

RUBI MERCADO,
Respondent/Appellant.

No. 2 CA-CV 2017-0039-FC
Filed September 20, 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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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 Pima County
No. D20150314
The Honorable James E. Marner, Judge

AFFIRMED

Cruz Aguirre, Marysville, Washington
In Propria Persona

Rubi Mercado, Simi Valley, California
In Propria Persona

IN RE MARRIAGE OF AGUIRRE & MERCADO
Decision of the Court

MEMORANDUM DECISION

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

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

¶1 Respondent Rubi Mercado appeals from the trial court’s order allowing petitioner Cruz Aguirre to relocate to Everett, Washington with their minor child. Because Mercado has failed to comply with the Rules of Civil Appellate Procedure, we deem her claims waived and affirm the judgment of the trial court.

¶2 On appeal, Mercado challenges the trial court’s ruling on the exclusion of certain evidence. She also claims the court “did abuse [its] discretion by granting [Aguirre] custody.” However, she has failed to develop any legal argument or cite any authority in support of her positions. See Ariz. R. Civ. App. P. 13(a)(6), (7)(A), (B); *Ritchie v. Krasner*, 221 Ariz. 288, ¶ 62, 211 P.3d 1272, 1289 (App. 2009) (“Opening briefs must present and address significant arguments, supported by authority that set forth the appellant’s position on the issue in question.”). Although we acknowledge that Mercado is not represented by counsel, “a party who conducts a case without an attorney is entitled to no more consideration from the court than a party represented by counsel, and is held to the same standards expected of a lawyer.” *Kelly v. NationsBanc Mortg. Corp.*, 199 Ariz. 284, ¶ 16, 17 P.3d 790, 793 (App. 2000). Accordingly, we deem any claims Mercado might have made waived. See *Rice v. Brakel*, 233 Ariz. 140, ¶ 28, 310 P.3d 16, 23 (App. 2013) (party that fails to “cite[] . . . relevant portions of the record [and] address[] the basis of the [trial] court’s decision” waives claim on appeal).

¶3 We therefore affirm the trial court’s order.