## IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

----00000----

Roger Bryner,	) MEMORANDUM DECISION ) (Not For Official Publication)
Petitioner and Appellant,	Case No. 20070811-CA
ν.	) FILED ) (June 26, 2008)
Lana Bryner,	)
Respondent and Appellee.	) <u>2008 UT App 238</u> )

\_\_\_\_

Third District, Salt Lake Department, 044904183 The Honorable William W. Barrett

Attorneys: Roger Bryner, Midvale, Appellant Pro Se Emily B. Smoak and Thomas J. Burns, Salt Lake City, for Appellee

\_\_\_\_

Before Judges Bench, Billings, and McHugh.

PER CURIAM:

Roger Bryner appeals the trial court's contempt order and judgment entered on September 25, 2007. This matter is before the court on its own motion to strike Mr. Bryner's brief.

The Utah Supreme Court has ruled that an appellate court is not required to address the merits of an appeal if an appellant's brief contains unfounded accusations impugning the integrity of the court. <u>See Peters v. Pine Meadow Ranch Home Ass'n</u>, 2007 UT 2, ¶ 1, 151 P.3d 962. In these situations, the brief may be stricken and the appellate court may decline to consider the appeal as a sanction for violations of rule 24(k) of the Utah Rules of Appellate Procedure. <u>See id.</u> ¶ 23.

In this court's April 10, 2008 Order, Mr. Bryner was specifically ordered that his future filings must not contain frivolous content or include any statements that: (1) constitute an attack on the integrity of Utah courts or judges, <u>see</u> <u>id.</u>  $\P\P$  7, 15; (2) are burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial, or scandalous, <u>see</u> Utah R. App. P. 24(k); or (3) are intended to harass the court, any party, or any counsel participating in the case.<sup>1</sup> Based on the violations of this court's Order and rule 24(k) of the Utah Rules of Appellate Procedure, we strike Mr. Bryner's brief and decline to reach the merits of his appeal. See Peters, 2007 UT 2, ¶ 23.

Accordingly, the trial court's order and judgment are affirmed.

Russell W. Bench, Judge

Judith M. Billings, Judge

Carolyn B. McHugh, Judge

1. Mr. Bryner was previously admonished that his filings would be stricken if they contained inappropriate content. See Bryner <u>v. Hon. Lindberg</u>, 2006 UT App 398U, paras. 6-8 (mem.) (per curiam).