

IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

-----ooOoo-----

Orem City,	)	MEMORANDUM DECISION
	)	(Not For Official Publication)
Plaintiff and Appellee,	)	Case No. 20070969-CA
	)	
v.	)	F I L E D
	)	(December 26, 2008)
Clayton Boyd Pronger,	)	
	)	2008 UT App 469
Defendant and Appellant.	)	

-----

Fourth District, Orem Department, 075207868  
The Honorable John C. Backlund

Attorneys: Clayton Boyd Pronger, Orem, Appellant Pro Se  
Robert J. Church, Orem, for Appellee

-----

Before Judges Greenwood, Billings, and Orme.

PER CURIAM:

Clayton Boyd Pronger appeals the district court's sentence fining him for various traffic offenses. We affirm.

Rule 24(a) of the Utah Rules of Appellate Procedure requires, among other things, that all appellate briefs submitted must 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. 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). When a party fails to meet the briefing requirements set forth in rule 24 of the Utah Rules of Appellate Procedure, the court may decline to address the arguments raised therein. See id. at 948.

This court specifically notified Pronger that the document that he filed as his original brief failed to meet the briefing requirements of rule 24, and that this court could decline to address his arguments if he did not file an appropriate brief. Pronger was given the opportunity to file a brief that complied with rule 24. Despite this court's request, Pronger declined to file a proper brief. Pronger's handwritten narrative which he titles as his brief is wholly deficient and utterly fails to comply with the requirements of rule 24. His pleas for justice and mercy are obviously sincere, but he fails to set forth any arguments, which if well-taken, would entitle him to reversal of his convictions.

Affirmed.

---

Pamela T. Greenwood,  
Presiding Judge

---

Judith M. Billings, Judge

---

Gregory K. Orme, Judge