

IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

-----ooOoo-----

Janet F. Erickson,)	MEMORANDUM DECISION
)	(Not For Official Publication)
Petitioner and Appellant,)	
)	Case No. 20060058-CA
v.)	
)	F I L E D
Kim W. Erickson,)	(August 10, 2006)
)	
Respondent and Appellee.)	2006 UT App 330

Fourth District, Provo Department, 044400581
The Honorable Anthony W. Schofield

Attorneys: Janet F. Erickson, Riverton, Appellant Pro Se
Randy S. Ludlow and Stephen R. Cook, Salt Lake City,
for Appellee

Before Judges Bench, Billings, and McHugh.

PER CURIAM:

Janet F. Erickson appeals the judgment of the district court. We affirm on the basis that Erickson's claims are inadequately briefed.

"It is well established that a reviewing court will not address arguments that are not adequately briefed." State v. Thomas, 961 P.2d 299, 304 (Utah 1998); see also Valcarce v. Fitzgerald, 961 P.2d 305, 313 (Utah 1998) (declining to address appellant's claim on appeal due to inadequate analysis).

Rule 24(a)(9) of the Utah Rules of Appellate Procedure states that the argument in the appellant's brief "shall contain the contentions and reasons of the appellant with respect to the issues presented, including the grounds for reviewing any issue not preserved in the trial court, with citations to the authorities, statutes, and parts of the record relied on." Utah R. App. P. 24(a)(9). Compliance with this rule "is mandatory, and failure to conform to these requirements may carry serious consequences. For example, 'briefs which are not in compliance may be disregarded or stricken, on motion or sua sponte by the court.'" Beehive Tel. Co. v. Public Serv. Comm'n, 2004 UT 18, ¶12, 89 P.3d 131 (quoting Utah R. App. P. 24(j)).

Erickson's brief fails to comply in any respect with rule 24(a)(9) and is otherwise "devoid of any meaningful analysis." State v. Garner, 2002 UT App 234, ¶12, 852 P.3d 467 (quotations and citation omitted). "To permit meaningful appellate review, briefs must comply with the briefing requirements sufficiently to enable us to understand . . . what particular errors were allegedly made, where in the record those errors can be found, and why, under applicable authorities, those errors are material ones necessitating reversal or other relief." State v. Lucero, 2002 UT App 135, ¶13, 47 P.3d 107 (alteration in original) (quotations and citation omitted). Erickson's brief fails to answer these questions.

When a party does not offer any meaningful analysis regarding a claim, we decline to reach the merits. See Thomas, 961 P.2d at 305. Accordingly, the judgment of the district court is affirmed.

Russell W, Bench,
Presiding Judge

Judith M. Billings, Judge

Carolyn B. McHugh, Judge