

IN THE
ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

JOHN C. BUCHANAN,
Plaintiff/Counterdefendant/Appellant,

v.

DWIGHT W. CONNELLY,
Defendant/Counterclaimant/Appellee.

No. 2 CA-CV 2015-0194
Filed April 22, 2016

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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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 Pima County
No. C20118596
The Honorable Sarah R. Simmons, Judge

AFFIRMED

John Buchanan, Oracle
In Propria Persona

Dwight W. Connely, Tucson
In Propria Persona

BUCHANAN v. CONNELLY
Decision of the Court

MEMORANDUM DECISION

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

ECKERSTROM, Chief Judge:

¶1 Plaintiff/counterdefendant/appellant John Buchanan appeals from the trial court's judgment in favor of defendant/counterclaimant/appellee Dwight Connely. Because Buchanan has failed to comply with the Rules of Civil Appellate Procedure, we deem his claims waived and affirm the judgment of the trial court.

¶2 On appeal, Buchanan has not identified any specific rulings he wishes this court to review. He has also failed to develop any legal argument or to provide appropriate citations to the record. *See* Ariz. R. Civ. App. P. 13(a)(7)(A) (requiring "supporting reasons for each contention, . . . with citations of legal authorities and appropriate references to the . . . record"); *In re \$26,980.00 U.S. Currency*, 199 Ariz. 291, ¶ 28, 18 P.3d 85, 93 (App. 2000) (noting conclusory assertions do not comply with appellate rules). While we acknowledge that Buchanan is not represented by counsel, "a party who conducts a case without an attorney is entitled to no more consideration from the court than a party represented by counsel, and is held to the same standards expected of a lawyer." *Kelly v. NationsBanc Mortg. Corp.*, 199 Ariz. 284, ¶ 16, 17 P.3d 790, 793 (App. 2000). Accordingly, we deem any claims Buchanan might have made waived. *See Rice v. Brakel*, 233 Ariz. 140, ¶ 28, 310 P.3d 16, 23 (App. 2013) (party that fails to "cite[] . . . relevant portions of the record [and] address[] the basis of the [trial] court's decision" waives claim on appeal); *Delmastro & Eells v. Taco Bell Corp.*, 228 Ariz. 134, n.2, 263 P.3d 683, 686 n.2 (App. 2011) (references to appendix do not substitute for appropriate record citations).

¶3 We affirm the judgment of the trial court.