

IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

-----ooOoo-----

Bonneville Billing & Collections,)	MEMORANDUM DECISION
)	(Not For Official Publication)
)	
Plaintiff and Appellee,)	Case No. 20070343-CA
)	
v.)	F I L E D
)	(March 6, 2008)
Shari D. Harper,)	
)	2008 UT App 75
Defendant and Appellant.)	

Second District, Ogden Department, 060903085
The Honorable W. Brent West

Attorneys: Shari D. Harper, Huntsville, Appellant Pro Se
G. Scott Jensen, Ogden, for Appellee

Before Judges Thorne, Bench, and Billings.

PER CURIAM:

Shari D. Harper appeals the district court's final order and judgment awarding damages to Bonneville Billing & Collections for breach of contract. Harper argues that the district court lacked jurisdiction over the matter. Accordingly, she asserts that the judgment is void.

While Harper's argument is not entirely clear, it appears that she is arguing that the district court lacked jurisdiction because the case did not involve any violation of a state "law or statute." As a result, she asserts that the district court usurped the power of the legislature in presiding over this breach of contract case. However, it is clear that district courts have jurisdiction in almost all civil cases, including actions alleging a breach of contract. See Utah Code Ann. § 78-3-4(1) (Supp. 2007) ("The district court has original jurisdiction in all matters civil and criminal, not excepted in the Utah Constitution and not prohibited by law."). Harper has not pointed to, nor is this court aware of, any constitutional provision or law that divests the district court of its jurisdiction to resolve the breach of contract claim at issue in

this case. Accordingly, the district court properly asserted its jurisdiction in resolving this matter.¹

Affirmed.²

William A. Thorne Jr.,
Associate Presiding Judge

Russell W. Bench, Judge

Judith M. Billings, Judge

1. To the extent Harper's argument could also be viewed as attacking other elements of jurisdiction or venue, those arguments also fail. In her answer to Bonneville Billing's complaint, Harper admitted both that she resided in Weber County and that the district court had proper jurisdiction over the case.

2. In her reply brief, Harper raises issues other than jurisdiction for the first time in this appeal. However, "we will not consider matters raised for the first time in the reply brief." Coleman v. Stevens, 2000 UT 98, ¶ 9, 17 P.3d 1122.