

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

---

IN RE THE MARRIAGE OF

ROBERT SCHMIDT,  
*Petitioner/Appellee,*

*and*

SUSI SCHMIDT,  
*Respondent/Appellant.*

No. 2 CA-CV 2019-0070-FC  
Filed February 27, 2020

---

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NOT FOR PUBLICATION  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. D20144084  
The Honorable Jennifer Langford, Judge Pro Tempore

**AFFIRMED**

---

COUNSEL

Booker Law PLLC, Tucson  
By Edward W. Booker  
*Counsel for Petitioner/Appellee*

Susi Schmidt, Tucson  
*In Propria Persona*

IN RE MARRIAGE OF SCHMIDT  
Decision of the Court

---

**MEMORANDUM DECISION**

Presiding Judge Staring authored the decision of the Court, in which Chief Judge Vásquez and Judge Brearcliffe concurred.

---

STARING, Presiding Judge:

¶1 Susi Schmidt appeals from an order enforcing the dissolution decree from her divorce. We affirm.

**Factual and Procedural Background**

¶2 After a trial in 2015, the court entered a decree dissolving Susi and Robert Schmidt’s marriage and providing for an equitable division of the community’s assets and debts. The court awarded Susi the marital home and ordered that she had twenty-four months to obtain refinancing and remove Robert from the mortgage. The decree also provided that if Susi was unable to refinance within twenty-four months, she was required to sell the house and the parties were to “divide equally any proceeds or debts resulting from the sale.”

¶3 Susi did not refinance the mortgage and sold the home to her father in April 2018. In July, after learning about the sale, Robert filed a petition seeking enforcement of the decree and an order finding Susi in contempt of court. After a hearing in November, the trial court ordered her to pay Robert one-half of the proceeds of the sale, “minus any offsets.” In April 2019, after additional briefing and further hearings, the court ordered Susi to reimburse Robert for a home owner’s association lien, pay him an offset for the proceeds from the sale of the home, and be responsible for the debt on a credit card.

¶4 This appeal followed. We have jurisdiction pursuant to A.R.S. §§ 12-120.21(A)(1) and 12-2101(A)(2).

**Discussion**

¶5 An opening brief in this court must contain an argument with “[a]ppellant’s contentions concerning each issue presented for review, with supporting reasons for each contention, and with citations of legal authorities and appropriate references to the portions of the record on which the appellant relies.” Ariz. R. Civ. App. P. 13(a)(7)(A). “We

IN RE MARRIAGE OF SCHMIDT  
Decision of the Court

generally decline to address issues that are not argued adequately, with appropriate citation to supporting authority.” *In re J.U.*, 241 Ariz. 156, ¶ 18 (App. 2016); see Ariz. R. Civ. App. P. 13(a)(7)(A).

¶6 In her opening brief, Susi contends the trial court’s ruling was “completely unjust” and “uninformed.” She also asks this court to hold Robert in contempt, impose sanctions against him, and order him to pay her costs and fees. However, she does not make any discernable legal argument, nor does she provide any “citations of legal authorities . . . on which [she] relies” to establish that the court erred.<sup>1</sup> See Ariz. R. Civ. App. P. 13(a)(7)(A). Susi has failed to comply with the rules of appellate procedure to such an extent that she has waived her arguments on appeal. See *Sholes v. Fernando*, 228 Ariz. 455, ¶ 16 (App. 2011) (insufficient argument on appeal may constitute abandonment and waiver of claim).

**Disposition**

¶7 For the foregoing reasons, we affirm.

---

<sup>1</sup>It is not incumbent on this court to develop legal arguments for a party. See *Ace Auto. Prods., Inc. v. Van Duyne*, 156 Ariz. 140, 143 (App. 1987). Moreover, although self-represented, Susi is “given the same consideration on appeal as one who has been represented by counsel” and she “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).