

IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

-----ooOoo-----

Reynold Johnson,)	MEMORANDUM DECISION
)	(Not For Official Publication)
Plaintiff and Appellant,)	
)	Case No. 20051039-CA
v.)	
)	F I L E D
Levan Town and Robert)	(October 13, 2006)
Shepherd,)	
)	2006 UT App 423
Defendants and Appellees.)	

Fourth District, Nephi Department, 040600040
The Honorable Donald J. Eyre Jr.

Attorneys: Reynold Johnson, Levan, Appellant Pro Se
Denton M. Hatch, Spanish Fork, for Appellee

Before Judges Bench, Greenwood, and Thorne.

PER CURIAM:

Reynold Johnson appeals the judgment of the district court. We affirm on the basis that Johnson'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). Furthermore, while "this court generally is lenient with pro se litigants," Lundahl v. Quinn, 2003 UT 11, ¶4, 67 P.3d 1000, such parties must still comply with our rules.

In deciding whether an argument has been adequately briefed, we look to the standard set forth in rule 24(a)(9) of the Utah Rules of Appellate Procedure. See Utah R. App. P. 24(a)(9); Thomas, 961 P.2d at 304. Rule 24(a)(9) 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 of Utah, 2004 UT 18, ¶12, 89 P.3d 131 (quoting Utah R. App. P. 24(j)).

Johnson's brief fails to comply with rule 24(a)(9). Johnson did not file a timely notice of appeal from the trial court's order granting summary judgment to the defendants. Johnson did file a postjudgment motion under rule 60(b) of the Utah Rules of Civil Procedure. See Utah R. Civ. P. 60(b). This motion was denied by the trial court and Johnson filed a timely appeal therefrom. See Utah R. App. P. 4(a). However, Johnson fails to set forth any argument regarding why the trial court erred when it denied this particular motion. 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.

The judgment of the district court is affirmed.¹

Russell W. Bench,
Presiding Judge

Pamela T. Greenwood,
Associate Presiding Judge

William A. Thorne Jr., Judge

1. Due to the disposition of this appeal, Johnson's "motion to deny appellees oral argument" has been rendered moot.