

IN THE  
**ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS**  
DIVISION TWO

---

SHELLEY K. MCCOY,  
*Plaintiff/Appellant,*

*v.*

KEN TAYLOR,  
*Defendant/Appellee.*

No. 2 CA-CV 2014-0137  
Filed April 15, 2015

---

THIS DECISION DOES NOT CREATE LEGAL PRECEDENT AND  
MAY NOT BE CITED EXCEPT AS AUTHORIZED BY APPLICABLE RULES.

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

*See Ariz. R. Sup. Ct. 111(c)(1); Ariz. R. Civ. App. P. 28(a)(1), (f).*

---

Appeal from the Superior Court in Cochise County  
No. CV201400040  
The Honorable Wallace R. Hoggatt, Judge

**APPEAL DISMISSED**

---

COUNSEL

Shelley Knuffke McCoy, Huachuca City  
*In Propria Persona*

Udall Law Firm, LLP, Tucson  
By Jeanna Chandler Nash  
*Counsel for Defendant/Appellee*

McCOY v. TAYLOR  
Decision of the Court

---

MEMORANDUM DECISION

Chief Judge Eckerstrom authored the decision of the Court, in which Presiding Judge Miller and Judge Espinosa concurred.

---

ECKERSTROM, Chief Judge:

¶1 Plaintiff/appellant Shelley McCoy attempts to challenge a judgment and several related orders of the Cochise County Superior Court that were entered in an appeal from the Benson Justice Court. The proceeding in that court concerned an injunction against harassment. As the defendant/appellee Ken Taylor correctly points out, our appellate jurisdiction is provided and limited by law, and an appeal to this court generally is unavailable from an appeal to the superior court. *Anderson v. Valley Union High Sch., Dist. No. 22*, 229 Ariz. 52, ¶¶ 2-3, 270 P.3d 879, 881-82 (App. 2012); see Ariz. Super. Ct. R. App. P. – Civ. 14(b).

¶2 Although McCoy emphasizes in her reply brief that she is proceeding in propria persona and is legally untrained, parties who choose to represent themselves are held to the same standards as attorneys with respect to applicable rules, statutes, and procedures. *In re Marriage of Williams*, 219 Ariz. 546, ¶ 13, 200 P.3d 1043, 1046 (App. 2008). McCoy has failed to specify the jurisdictional basis for her appeal, as is required by Rule 13(a)(4), Ariz. R. Civ. App. P. She also has failed to respond to Taylor’s arguments that we lack appellate jurisdiction. “A failure to reply to arguments raised in an answering brief may justify a summary disposition of an appeal.” *Ariz. Dep’t of Pub. Safety v. Indus. Comm’n*, 170 Ariz. 275, 277, 823 P.2d 1283, 1285 (App. 1991).

¶3 For these reasons, the appeal is dismissed. We grant Taylor’s request for costs, subject to his compliance with Rule 21, Ariz. R. Civ. App. P. See *Robinson v. Kay*, 225 Ariz. 191, ¶ 8, 236 P.3d 418, 420 (App. 2010). We deny his request for attorney fees.