

Cite as 2012 Ark. App. 400

ARKANSAS COURT OF APPEALS

DIVISION III

No. CA11-509

DAVID W. PASCHAL

APPELLANT

V.

TRESSA PASCHAL

APPELLEE

Opinion Delivered June 20, 2012

APPEAL FROM THE WASHINGTON
COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT
[NO. DR-2011-21-7]HONORABLE JOANNA TAYLOR,
JUDGE

REBRIEFING ORDERED

RAYMOND R. ABRAMSON, Judge

David Paschal appeals from the order of protection entered by the Washington County Circuit Court on February 7, 2011. We order rebriefing a second time. *Paschal v. Paschal*, 2012 Ark. App. 18.

Appellant's substituted brief again fails to comply with our rules regarding abstracting because it is in question-and-answer format. *See* Ark. Sup. Ct. R. 4-2(a)(5) (2011). Because appellant has failed to comply with our rule concerning abstracting, we order appellant to file a substituted brief curing the deficiencies in the abstract within fifteen days from the date of entry of this order. *See* Ark. Sup. Ct. R. 4-2(b)(3). Before filing the substituted brief, counsel should review the model appellant's brief posted on the Arkansas Judiciary website. After service of the substituted brief, appellee will have the opportunity to file a responsive brief in the time prescribed by the supreme court clerk. Appellant's counsel is strongly

Cite as 2012 Ark. App. 400

encouraged to review Rule 4-2 in its entirety as it relates to the abstract and addendum, as well as the entire record, to ensure that no additional deficiencies are present. Failure to file a complying abstract, addendum, and brief within the prescribed time may result in affirmance of the order or judgment due to noncompliance with Rule 4-2. *See* Ark. Sup. Ct. R. 4-2(b)(3) (2011); *see also Kirkland v. Sandlin*, 2011 Ark. 106 (per curiam).

Rebriefing ordered.

VAUGHT, C.J., and ROBBINS, J., agree.