

IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

-----ooOoo-----

R.T. & R.H., LLC,)	MEMORANDUM DECISION
)	(Not For Official Publication)
Plaintiff and Appellant,)	
)	Case No. 20070189-CA
v.)	
)	F I L E D
Lehi City,)	(September 20, 2007)
)	
Defendant and Appellee.)	2007 UT App 308

Fourth District, Provo Department, 050403514
The Honorable James R. Taylor

Attorneys: E. Craig Smay, Salt Lake City, for Appellant
Jody K. Burnett, Salt Lake City, for Appellee

Before Judges Bench, Greenwood, and McHugh.

PER CURIAM:

Appellant appeals the district court judgment. We affirm on the basis that Appellant'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).

Utah Rule of Appellate Procedure 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, 2004 UT 18, ¶12, 89 P.3d 131 (quoting Utah R. App. P. 24(j)).

Appellant's brief fails to comply with rule 24(a)(9). Appellant alleges that the district court erred in some manner when it dismissed Appellant's claims pursuant to an order granting summary judgment. However, there is little or no explanation as to how or why the district court erred. Appellant sets forth bare assertions such as "genuine issues of material fact remain," but fails to describe what issues it refers to, or why such issues require reversal of the district court's decision to grant summary judgment.

"To permit meaningful appellate review, briefs must comply with the briefing requirements sufficiently to enable us to understand . . . what particular errors were allegedly made, where in the record those errors can be found, and why, under applicable authorities, those errors are material ones necessitating reversal or other relief." State v. Lucero, 2002 UT App 135, ¶13, 47 P.3d 107 (alteration in original) (quoting Burns v. Summerhays, 927 P.2d 197, 199 (Utah Ct. App. 1996)). 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.

Because Appellant's brief fails to explain why this court should reverse the district court decision, we decline to reach the merits of Appellant's claims.

Affirmed.

WE CONCUR:

Russell W. Bench,
Presiding Judge

Carolyn B. McHugh, Judge

I DISSENT:

Pamela T. Greenwood,
Associate Presiding Judge