

IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

-----ooOoo-----

Vernon Ray Rigby,)	MEMORANDUM DECISION
)	(Not For Official Publication)
Petitioner and Appellant,)	
)	Case No. 20050616-CA
v.)	
)	F I L E D
Loralie Kemp Rigby,)	(July 13, 2006)
)	
Respondent and Appellee.)	2006 UT App 299

Third District, Salt Lake Department, 034903791
The Honorable Robert W. Adkins
The Honorable Deno Himonas

Attorneys: David J. Friel, Salt Lake City, for Appellant
 Jay L. Kessler, Magna, for Appellee

Before Judges Billings, McHugh, and Orme.

PER CURIAM:

Vernon Ray Rigby appeals the divorce decree entered by the trial court. He asserts the trial court failed to make adequate findings in awarding alimony, erred in finding him in contempt, and erred in unevenly dividing the equity in the marital house.

We decline to reach these issues because of the insufficiency of Appellant's brief. Pursuant to Utah Rule of Appellate Procedure 24, an appellant's brief must contain a statement of the facts relevant to the issues presented, supported with citations to the record. See Utah R. App. P. 24(a)(7). Additionally, briefs must include an argument containing appellant's contentions and reasons with respect to the issues presented, with citations to authorities, statutes, and parts of the record relied on. See Utah R. App. P. 24(a)(9). If a party seeks to challenge a finding of fact, that party must marshal the evidence in support of the challenged finding. See id.

Appellant's brief fails to comply with these standards. He does not provide a statement of facts with the relevant facts and record citations. There are only four record citations in the entire brief. Three of the four issues presented in the brief

consist of a page or less of conclusory assertions with no logical, reasoned legal argument and no factual support. The sole argument of more than one page contends that the evidence on which the trial court relied cannot be discerned from the trial court's decision. However, the evidence in the record as a whole was clear and uncontroverted, and Appellant establishes no factual dispute.

In sum, Appellant's brief fails to comply with rule 24. This court need not address issues inadequately briefed. See MacKay v. Hardy, 973 P.2d 941, 947-48 (Utah 1998).

Affirmed.

Judith M. Billings, Judge

Carolyn B. McHugh, Judge

Gregory K. Orme, Judge