

IN THE
ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

ADVANCED PROPERTY TAX LIENS, INC.,
A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY,
Plaintiff/Appellee,

v.

JOSE MARTIN FUENTES AND MARIA DEL ROSARIO FUENTES,
HUSBAND AND WIFE,
Defendants/Appellants.

No. 2 CA-CV 2018-0135
Filed March 4, 2019

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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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 Santa Cruz County
No. CV201700282
The Honorable Anna Montoya-Paez, Judge

AFFIRMED

COUNSEL

Kessler Law Group, Scottsdale
By Eric W. Kessler
Counsel for Plaintiff/Appellee

Jose Martin Fuentes and Maria del Rosario Fuentes, Tucson
In Propria Personae

MEMORANDUM DECISION

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

E P P I C H, Presiding Judge:

¶1 Jose Fuentes and Maria del Rosario Fuentes appeal from the trial court's order quieting title to real property in favor of Advanced Property Tax Liens, Inc., contending the court treated them "unfairly."¹ We affirm.

¶2 In 2017, Advanced filed a complaint in superior court seeking to quiet title to real property based on a tax lien Advanced had purchased against the property. Advanced subsequently sought, and was granted, default judgment based on Fuentes's failure to defend against the complaint. Fuentes timely appealed; we have jurisdiction pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-2101(A)(1).

¶3 On appeal, Fuentes's opening brief is wholly devoid of legal argument and authority; accordingly, it fails to comply with the requirements of Rule 13(a)(7), Ariz. R. Civ. App. P. We therefore consider any arguments waived, and will not address them. *See Ritchie v. Krasner*, 221 Ariz. 288, ¶ 62 (App. 2009) (insufficient argument on appeal may constitute abandonment and waiver of claim). And because Fuentes has failed to provide any legal justification for filing this appeal, we grant Advanced's request for attorney fees and costs incurred on appeal upon its compliance with Rule 21, Ariz. R. Civ. App. P. *See* A.R.S. § 12-349(A)(1) (allowing award of attorney fees if party "[b]rings or defends a claim without substantial justification").

¶4 We affirm the trial court's judgment.

¹Although Fuentes is self-represented, a self-represented civil litigant "is given the same consideration on appeal as one who has been represented by counsel," and "is held to the same familiarity with court procedures and the same notice of statutes, rules, and legal principles as is expected of a lawyer." *Higgins v. Higgins*, 194 Ariz. 266, ¶ 12 (App. 1999).