

IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

-----ooOoo-----

State of Utah,)	MEMORANDUM DECISION
)	(Not For Official Publication)
Plaintiff and Appellee,)	
)	Case No. 20060667-CA
v.)	
)	F I L E D
Brent E. Hill,)	(June 7, 2007)
)	
Defendant and Appellant.)	2007 UT App 201

Second District, Morgan Department, 055500004
The Honorable Michael D. Lyon

Attorneys: J. Franklin Allred, Erda, for Appellant
 Jann L. Farris, Morgan, for Appellee

Before Judges Bench, McHugh, and Thorne.

PER CURIAM:

Brent E. Hill appeals his conviction of carrying a concealed dangerous weapon, a class A misdemeanor. See Utah Code Ann. § 76-10-504(1)(b) (Supp. 2006). We affirm.

It is well established that appellate courts will not address arguments that are inadequately briefed. See State v. Thomas, 961 P.2d 299, 304 (Utah 1998). Rule 24(a)(9) mandates that the appellant's argument contain the contentions and reasons with respect to the issues presented. See Utah R. App. P. 24(a)(9). The rule implicitly requires the development of supporting authority and reasoned analysis. See Thomas, 961 P.2d at 305. An argument will be considered inadequately briefed "when the overall analysis of the issue is so lacking as to shift the burden of research and analysis to the reviewing court." Id.

Hill presents two issues for review but does not adequately brief either issue. Although he cites to some statutory language, he does not provide any analysis or reasoned argument to support his proposed interpretation. He presents no case law support for any point, not even to provide a general standard for

statutory interpretation issues. In view of the lack of analysis, we decline to address the issues.

Affirmed.

Russell W. Bench,
Presiding Judge

Carolyn B. McHugh, Judge

William A. Thorne Jr., Judge