

Dismiss and Opinion Filed July 7 , 2016.



In The
Court of Appeals
Fifth District of Texas at Dallas

No. 05-15-00854-CV

MICHAEL A. HUGHES, Appellant

V.

DALLAS COUNTY, CITY OF DALLAS, DALLAS INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT, DALLAS COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT, DALLAS COUNTY SCHOOL EQUALIZATION FUND, AND PARKLAND HOSPITAL DISTRICT, Appellees

On Appeal from the 95th Judicial District Court
Dallas County, Texas
Trial Court Cause No. TX-14-41301

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Before Chief Justice Wright, Justice Bridges, and Justice Lang
Opinion by Justice Lang

This is an appeal from a judgment for delinquent taxes and foreclosure of a tax lien. *See* TEX. TAX CODE ANN. § 33.41(West 2015). Appearing pro se, Michael A. Hughes filed a brief that fails to comply with the rules of appellate procedure.¹ *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 38.1. Significantly, it does not contain (1) a statement of the facts supported by record reference; (2) an accurate statement of the arguments made in the body of the brief; or (3) argument for the contentions made with appropriate citations to authorities and to the record. *See id.* 38.1(g), (h),

¹ Hughes filed the brief on his and his wife's behalves, though his wife did not file a notice of appeal.

(i). Although directed more than eight months ago to file an amended brief in compliance with the rules and cautioned that failure to comply could result in dismissal of the appeal, Hughes has not filed an amended brief.² Without adequate briefing, nothing is presented for review. *See Birnbaum v. Law Offices of G. David Westfall, P.C.*, 120 S.W.3d 470, 477 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2003, pet. denied). Accordingly, we dismiss this appeal. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 38.8(a)(1), 38.9(a), 42.3(b),(c); *Bolling v. Farmers Branch Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 315 S.W.3d 893, 896-97 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2010, no pet.).

/Douglas S. Lang/
DOUGLAS S. LANG
JUSTICE

150854F.P05

² On the same day he was directed to file an amended brief, Hughes filed a motion for extension of time to file a corrected brief. However, the motion was miscalendared as the amended brief and never determined. Despite the lack of a ruling, Hughes did not follow-up on the motion or try to file a corrected brief, even after being notified of the date the appeal would be submitted for determination.



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

JUDGMENT

MICHAEL A. HUGHES, Appellant

No. 05-15-00854-CV V.

DALLAS COUNTY, CITY OF DALLAS,
DALLAS INDEPENDENT SCHOOL
DISTRICT, DALLAS COUNTY
COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT,
DALLAS COUNTY SCHOOL
EQUALIZATION FUND, DALLAS
INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT,
AND PARKLAND HOSPITAL DISTRICT,
Appellees

On Appeal from the 95th Judicial District
Court, Dallas County, Texas
Trial Court Cause No. TX-14-41301.
Opinion delivered by Justice Lang. Chief
Justice Wright and Justice Bridges
participating.

In accordance with this Court's opinion of this date, we **DISMISS** the appeal.

We **ORDER** appellees Dallas County, City of Dallas, Dallas Independent School District, Dallas County Community College District, Dallas County School Equalization Fund, and Parkland Hospital District recover their costs of this appeal from appellant Michael A. Hughes.

Judgment entered this 7th day of July, 2016.