

IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

-----ooOoo-----

State of Utah,	)	MEMORANDUM DECISION
	)	(Not For Official Publication)
Plaintiff and Appellee,	)	
	)	Case No. 20070192-CA
v.	)	
	)	F I L E D
Clark Robinson,	)	(November 1, 2007)
	)	
Defendant and Appellant.	)	<span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">2007 UT App 356</span>

-----

Third District, Salt Lake Department, 051908921  
The Honorable Ann Boyden

Attorneys: Clark C. Robinson, Draper, Appellant Pro Se  
James M. Cope, Salt Lake City, for Appellee

-----

Before Judges Greenwood, Davis, and McHugh.

PER CURIAM:

Clark Robinson appeals his conviction of propelling a substance or object at a correctional or peace officer. See Utah Code Ann. § 76-5-102.6 (Supp. 2007). The sole issue raised in Robinson's brief is whether his right to a speedy trial was violated.

Robinson has failed to adequately brief the issue presented for review. "An adequate brief is one that fully identifies and analyzes the issues with citation to relevant legal authority." State v. Lee, 2006 UT 5, ¶ 22, 128 P.3d 1179. Here the entirety of Robinson's argument consists of the following statement: "The State cannot prosecute this case because it took more than a year to get to trial." Robinson cites no authority to support his argument other than a general reference to the Sixth Amendment of the United States Constitution. Numerous factors influence whether a person's right to a speedy trial has been violated. See Barker v. Wingo, 407 U.S. 514, 530 (1972) (stating that factors such as "length of the delay, the reason for the delay, the defendant's assertion of his right, and the prejudice to the defendant" must be considered in speedy trial analysis). Robinson has failed to address any of these factors and how they relate to his case. For example, the limited record before the court indicates that Robinson and his counsel stipulated to at

least two delays of proceedings during the course of the criminal process. It also demonstrates that Robinson did not assert his right to a speedy trial until the day of trial. Robinson's failure to address these and other factors in his brief makes it impossible for this court to adequately review his claim. Accordingly, because Robinson failed to adequately brief this issue, we decline to address it. See Lee, 2006 UT 5, ¶ 22.

Affirmed.

---

Pamela T. Greenwood,  
Associate Presiding Judge

---

James Z. Davis, Judge

---

Carolyn B. McHugh, Judge