

IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

-----ooOoo-----

Debbie G. Haggard,)	MEMORANDUM DECISION
)	(Not For Official Publication)
Petitioner,)	
)	Case No. 20080690-CA
v.)	
)	F I L E D
)	(March 5, 2009)
Workforce Appeals Board,)	
Department of Workforce)	2009 UT App 65
Services; and Accent Surfaces,)	
)	
Respondents.)	

Original Proceeding in this Court

Attorneys: Debbie G. Haggard, West Valley City, Petitioner Pro
Se
Suzan Pixton, Salt Lake City, for Respondent
Workforce Appeals Board

Before Judges Bench, Davis, and McHugh.

PER CURIAM:

Debbie G. Haggard appeals the decision of the Workforce Appeals Board (the Board) concluding that she was terminated with just cause and was ineligible for unemployment benefits.

Rule 24(a) of the Utah Rules of Appellate Procedure requires, among other things, that all appellate briefs submitted contain a table of contents, a table of authorities, a statement of jurisdiction, a statement of the issues presented for appeal, including the standard of appellate review with supporting authority, and proper citations to the record. See Utah R. App. P. 24(a). Rule 24(a)(9) also requires that all appellate briefs contain proper legal analysis with citations to relevant legal authority supporting the arguments raised therein. See *id.* R. 24(a)(9).

An appellate court is not a depository in which parties may dump the burden of their argument and research. See Smith v. Four Corners Mental Health Ctr., Inc., 2003 UT 23, ¶ 46, 70 P.3d 904. This court may decline to consider the merits of the issues briefed if a party fails to cite relevant legal authority and

also fails to provide meaningful analysis of such legal authority. See State v. Shepherd, 1999 UT App 305, ¶ 25, 989 P.2d 503. Although Utah appellate courts are reluctant to penalize self-represented litigants for technical rule violations, the court will not assume a party's burden of argument and research. See Allen v. Friel, 2008 UT 56, ¶ 9, 194 P.3d 903. The Utah Supreme Court has expressly stated that "[o]ur rules of appellate procedure clearly set forth the requirements that appellants and appellees must meet when submitting briefs." MacKay v. Hardy, 973 P.2d 941, 947 (Utah 1998).

This court notified Haggard of the briefing requirements set forth in rule 24. Despite this court's request that Haggard comply with the briefing requirements, Haggard declined to file a proper brief. Haggard's narrative which she titles "Answer and Certification of Record" is wholly deficient and utterly fails to comply with the briefing requirements of rule 24. See Utah R. App. P. 24(a). Haggard fails to raise any legal argument, which if well-taken, would entitle her to reversal of the Board's decision.

Accordingly, the Board's July 31, 2008 decision is affirmed.

Russell W. Bench, Judge

James Z. Davis, Judge

Carolyn B. McHugh, Judge