

ARKANSAS COURT OF APPEALS

DIVISION I

No. CA08-1405

CHARLES V. GRASSI, SR.
APPELLANT

V.

JAMES W. HYDEN AND HYDEN,
MIRON & FOSTER, P.L.L.C.
APPELLEES

Opinion Delivered November 18, 2009

APPEAL FROM THE PULASKI
COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT,
[NO. CV 02-5754]

HONORABLE JAMES MAXWELL
MOODY, JR., JUDGE

REBRIEFING ORDERED

LARRY D. VAUGHT, Chief Judge

This is a legal-malpractice case. Charles Grassi, Sr., appeals from the circuit court's entry of judgment on a directed verdict for appellees James Hyden and his firm, Hyden, Miron & Foster, P.L.L.C. We order rebriefing because appellant's addendum does not comply with Ark. Sup. Ct. R. 4-2(a)(8).

The addendum does not reflect that this case is final for purposes of appeal. An appellant's addendum must include relevant pleadings, documents, or exhibits essential to an understanding of the case and the court's jurisdiction on appeal. Ark. Sup. Ct. R. 4-2(a)(8). Grassi filed his complaint against appellees and three other defendants, Bradley Frieberg, Cooper Creek Capital, L.L.C., and Glenn Borkowski. The order determining the claim against Borkowski is in appellees' supplemental addendum. The order dismissing the claims

Cite as 2009 Ark. App. 766

against the other defendants is essential to this court's jurisdiction on appeal. Although it is in the record, it is not in the addendum.

Appellant has fifteen days from the date of this order in which to file a substituted brief with an addendum containing the order dismissing the claims against Frieberg and Cooper Creek Capital. *See* Ark. Sup. Ct. R. 4-2(b)(3). If appellant fails to file a brief with a complying addendum within the prescribed time, the judgment may be affirmed for noncompliance with Rule 4-2(a)(8). *Id.*

Rebriefing ordered.

HART and ROBBINS, JJ., agree.