



**Fourth Court of Appeals**  
**San Antonio, Texas**

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

No. 04-21-00571-CV

Suhair **SUHIEMAT**,  
Appellant

v.

Adnan **HASSOUNEH**,  
Appellee

From the 73rd Judicial District Court, Bexar County, Texas  
Trial Court No. 2021-CI-02026  
Honorable Angelica Jimenez, Judge Presiding

Opinion by: Luz Elena D. Chapa, Justice

Sitting: Rebeca C. Martinez, Chief Justice  
Luz Elena D. Chapa, Justice  
Lori I. Valenzuela, Justice

Delivered and Filed: August 24, 2022

**AFFIRMED**

Appellant Suhair Suhiemat appeals a final decree of divorce dissolving her marriage to appellee Adnan Hassouneh. Because we conclude Suhiemat failed to adequately brief her issues and therefore did not present anything for our review, we affirm the trial court's judgment.

**BACKGROUND**

Suhiemat and Hassouneh were married in 1997, and Suhiemat petitioned for divorce in 2021. One child, K.H., was born during the marriage. After a hearing, the trial court entered temporary orders appointing Suhiemat and Hassouneh temporary joint managing conservators of

K.H., outlining each parties' possession rights, and ordering Hassounch to pay Suhiemat monthly child support. Hassounch then moved for mediation, and the trial court referred the case to mediation. At mediation, the parties were represented by counsel, and they entered a mediated settlement agreement. The trial court then signed a "Final Decree of Divorce and Order for Conservatorship and Child Support" in accordance with the agreement. Suhiemat now appeals.

#### ANALYSIS

On appeal, Suhiemat contends the evidence is factually insufficient to support the mediated settlement agreement. To support her contention, she states the mediated settlement agreement contains terms her lawyer agreed to without her consent, and her lawyer misled and bullied her into entering the agreement.

We begin our review of this appeal by addressing Suhiemat's brief. Suhiemat is representing herself on appeal, and as a pro se litigant, we must hold her "to the same standards of licensed attorneys and require [her] to comply with applicable rules of procedure." *Kehoe v. Kendall County*, No. 04-19-00825-CV, 2020 WL 4045991, at \*1 (Tex. App.—San Antonio July 15, 2020, no pet.) (mem. op.). Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 38.1 requires an appellant's brief to "contain clear and concise arguments supported by appropriate citations to the applicable authorities and the appellate record." *Id.* (citing TEX. R. APP. P. 38.1). "An appellant bears the burden to discuss [her] assertions of error, and we have no duty—or even right—to perform an independent review of the record and applicable law to determine whether there was error." *Id.* (citing *Tchernowitz v. The Gardens at Clearwater*, No. 04-15-00716-CV, 2016 WL 6247008, at \*1 (Tex. App.—San Antonio Oct. 26, 2016, no pet.) (mem. op.) (internal quotations omitted)).

Here, Suhiemat's brief fails to comply substantively with Rule 38.1 because it lacks any actual legal argument and does not include any citations to the appellate record or legal authority. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 38.1(i) (stating brief must contain clear and concise argument for contentions

made with appropriate citations to authorities and to appellate record). When, as here, the appellate issues are not supported by any argument or citation to the record or legal authority, nothing is presented for review. *See Kehoe*, 2020 WL 4045991, at \*1; *see also Green v. Kaposta*, 152 S.W.3d 839, 841 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2005, no pet). Even if we broadly construe Suhiemat’s factual sufficiency challenge, Suhiemat does not explain or discuss how the evidence does not support the final divorce decree signed by the trial court. Instead, Suhiemat’s brief focuses on her lawyer’s behavior and how it caused her to enter into the mediated settlement agreement. We further note there is no reporter’s record in this case, and because we have no reporter’s record by which to review the sufficiency of the evidence, we must presume the evidence was factually sufficient to support the trial court’s judgment. *See Bell v. State for S.E.G.*, No. 08-20-00149-CV, 2021 WL 937457, \*2 (Tex. App.—El Paso Mar. 11, 2021, no pet.) (mem. op.) (presuming evidence was sufficient when no reporter’s record taken). Accordingly, based on the foregoing, we hold Suhiemat’s brief is inadequate, presenting nothing for our review.

#### CONCLUSION

We affirm the trial court’s judgment.

Luz Elena D. Chapa, Justice