

IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

-----ooOoo-----

State of Utah,)	MEMORANDUM DECISION
)	(Not For Official Publication)
Plaintiff and Appellee,)	
)	Case No. 20070962-CA
v.)	
)	F I L E D
Ernest John Young,)	(December 11, 2008)
)	
Defendant and Appellant.)	2008 UT App 453

Fourth District, Provo Department, 061402072
The Honorable Gary D. Stott

Attorneys: Brook J. Sessions, Provo, for Appellant
Mark L. Shurtleff and Christine F. Soltis, Salt Lake
City, for Appellee

Before Judges Greenwood, Thorne, and Orme.

PER CURIAM:

Ernest John Young appeals his conviction of influencing, impeding, or retaliating against a judge. Young argues that the district court erred in denying his motion to withdraw his guilty plea. We affirm.

Rule 24(a)(9) of the Utah Rules of Appellate Procedure requires an appellant's brief to include "contentions and reasons" as to why the appellant believes he is entitled to relief. See Utah R. App. P. 24(a)(9). In analyzing this requirement, the Utah appellate courts have "repeatedly noted that a brief is inadequate if 'it merely contains bald citations to authority [without] development of that authority and reasoned analysis based on that authority.'" Allen v. Friel, 2008 UT 56, ¶ 9, 194 P.3d 903 (citation omitted). As such, "[a]n appellate court is not 'a depository in which [a party] may dump the burden of argument and research.'" Id. (citation omitted). Here, Young provides the court with a discussion of the law concerning standards for compliance with rule 11 of the Utah Rules of Criminal Procedure, as well as those dealing with withdrawal of guilty pleas. However, Young makes no effort to analyze the facts of his case based upon the law he cites. As such, the court is left to speculate as to the precise reasons why Young

believes his guilty plea was not entered into knowingly and voluntarily. Ultimately, it is not the court's responsibility to scour the record looking for facts and arguments to support an appellant's broad assertions. See id. Accordingly, because Young has failed to adequately brief the issue raised on appeal, we decline to address it.¹

Affirmed.

Pamela T. Greenwood,
Presiding Judge

William A. Thorne Jr.,
Associate Presiding Judge

Gregory K. Orme, Judge

¹We note that if Young insisted that counsel file this appeal despite counsel's belief that the issues raised were without merit, counsel should have submitted a brief that complied with the requirements of Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 783 (1967), and State v. Clayton, 639 P.2d 168 (Utah 1981).