

**AFFIRMED; Opinion Filed May 26, 2016.**



**In The  
Court of Appeals  
Fifth District of Texas at Dallas**

---

**No. 05-14-01503-CV**

---

**HOSSEIN JAHANSHAH, Appellant  
V.  
MASOOMEH JANGRAVI, Appellee**

---

**On Appeal from the 302nd Judicial District Court  
Dallas County, Texas  
Trial Court Cause No. DF-11-03913**

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Before Justices Lang-Miers, Evans, and Brown  
Opinion by Justice Evans

Hossein Jahanshahi appeals from the trial court's Order in Suit to Modify the Parent-Child Relationship. Having concluded that Jahanshahi has failed to present and brief his complaints in accordance with the rules of appellate procedure, we affirm the trial court's judgment.

Representing himself without an attorney, Jahanshahi filed his original brief on March 16, 2015. We hold pro se litigants to the same standards as licensed attorneys and require them to comply with applicable laws and rules of procedure. *See Bolling v. Farmers Branch Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 315 S.W.3d 893, 895 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2010, no pet.); *Strange v. Continental Cas. Co.*, 126 S.W.3d 676, 678 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2004, pet. denied). Our appellate rules have specific briefing provisions that require an appellant to state concisely his complaint, provide an

understandable, succinct, and clear argument to support his contentions, and cite and apply relevant law together with appropriate record references. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 38.1(f), (h), and (i); *Bolling*, 315 S.W.3d at 895; *Strange*, 126 S.W.3d at 678.

On March 24, 2015, we informed Jahanshahi by letter that his original brief was deficient in numerous respects. Those deficiencies included, but were not limited to the absence of: (1) an index of authorities, (2) a concise statement of the case supported by record references, (3) a concise statement of the facts supported by record references, (4) a succinct, clear, and accurate statement of the arguments made in the body of the brief with appropriate citations to legal authority and the record, (5) a proper certificate of service, and (6) relevant documents from the appendix. We further instructed Jahanshahi to file an amended brief that complied with the rules of appellate procedure within ten days. Our notice advised Jahanshahi that his failure to file a compliant amended brief, “may result in dismissal of this appeal without further notice from the Court. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 38.8(a)(1), 42.3 (b), (c).” Despite twice being given additional time to file an amended brief that complied with the rules of appellate procedure, Jahanshahi failed to file the requested brief.<sup>1</sup> We therefore ordered the appeal to be submitted on the brief Jahanshahi filed on March 16, 2015.

Excluding the cover page and attached exhibit, the March 16 brief, including the “Table of Contents,” is three pages in length. The “Statement of the Case” and “Statement of Facts” portions contain no supporting references to the record. In his “Statement of Issues,” Jahanshahi presents the following: (1) “[w]hether the district court erred in ordering [Jahanshahi] surrender his child *no reason, no document, no justification, just acquisition*” [emphasis in original]; (2) “whether district court impermissibly altered the terms of . . . divorce decree without

---

<sup>1</sup> Instead of filing a corrected brief, Jahanshahi filed a motion in which he requested that we “speed up court date for new trial” and remove the trial judge and replace her with a male judge. We denied Jahanshahi’s motion.

appearance of his attorney, it never asked for [m]odifying [d]ivorce decree”; (3) “[w]hether the district court dose [sic] have obligation to look at cause why [Jahanshahi] paying double child support from 2011–2014, still he cannot see his child?”

The argument section of the brief, however, lacks any discussion or legal analysis with respect to the issues Jahanshahi purports to present and contains no citations to legal authority or the record. Instead, it merely restates two of the above issues, questions the impartiality of the trial judge, asserts the trial court had a personal bias against Jahanshahi, contends that his child support obligations should stop until Jahanshahi’s child is returned to Texas, and requests attorney’s fees.

Jahanshahi has the burden to present and discuss his assertions of error in compliance with the appellate briefing rules. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 38.1(i); *Bolling*, 315 S.W.3d at 895; *Strange*, 126 S.W.3d at 678. We have no right or obligation to search through the record to find facts or research relevant law that might support an appellant’s position because doing so would “improperly transform this Court from neutral adjudicators to advocates.” *Chappell v. Allen*, 414 S.W.3d 316, 321 (Tex. App.—El Paso 2013, no pet.) (citing *Valadez v. Avitia*, 238 S.W.3d 843, 845 (Tex. App.—El Paso 2007, no pet.)). Because Jahanshahi has failed to adequately brief the complaints he has raised in this appeal in accordance with the rules of appellate procedure, he has failed to raise any issue for our review. We affirm the trial court’s order.

141503F.P05

/David Evans/  
DAVID EVANS  
JUSTICE

---



**Court of Appeals  
Fifth District of Texas at Dallas**

**JUDGMENT**

HOSSEIN JAHANSHAH, Appellant

No. 05-14-01503-CV      V.

MASOOMEH JANGRAVI, Appellee

On Appeal from the 302nd Judicial District  
Court, Dallas County, Texas

Trial Court Cause No. DF-11-03913

Opinion delivered by Justice Evans, Justices  
Lang-Miers and Brown participating.

In accordance with this Court's opinion of this date, the trial court's October 30, 2014 order in suit to modify parent-child relationship is **AFFIRMED**.

It is **ORDERED** that appellee Massoomah Jangravi recover her costs of this appeal from appellant Hossein Jahanshahi.

Judgment entered this 26th day of May, 2016.