

IN THE
ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

MELINDA GABRIELLA VALENZUELA,
Plaintiff/Appellant,

v.

CORIZON HEALTH, INC.,
Defendant/Appellee.

No. 2 CA-CV 2016-0072
Filed September 9, 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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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 Pinal County
No. S1100CV201501064
The Honorable Stephen F. McCarville, Judge

APPEAL DISMISSED

Melinda G. Valenzuela, Buckeye
In Propria Persona

MEMORANDUM DECISION

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

VALENZUELA v. CORIZON HEALTH
Decision of the Court

E C K E R S T R O M, Chief Judge:

¶1 Appellant Melinda Valenzuela, who represents herself in this appeal, challenges a judgment dismissing without prejudice her complaint against appellee Corizon Health, Inc. An appellant has a duty to identify the jurisdictional basis of an appeal under Rule 13(a)(4), Ariz. R. Civ. App. P. “We, in turn, have an independent duty to confirm our jurisdiction over the appeal before us.” *Anderson v. Valley Union High Sch., Dist. No. 22*, 229 Ariz. 52, ¶ 2, 270 P.3d 879, 881 (App. 2012).

¶2 “A dismissal without prejudice is not a final judgment and is therefore generally not appealable.” *Canyon Ambulatory Surgery Ctr. v. SCF Ariz.*, 225 Ariz. 414, ¶ 14, 239 P.3d 733, 737-38 (App. 2010). In her opening brief, Valenzuela fails to specify the basis of this court’s appellate jurisdiction and explain why, in this particular case, the “dismissal . . . without prejudice is appealable.” *Id.* Indeed, she fails to provide any “citations of legal authorities and . . . references to the . . . record.” Ariz. R. Civ. App. P. 13(a)(7)(A). “It is not incumbent upon th[is] court to develop an argument for a party.” *Ace Auto. Prods., Inc. v. Van Duyne*, 156 Ariz. 140, 143, 750 P.2d 898, 901 (App. 1987). Litigants who represent themselves are held to the same standards as attorneys in terms of complying with procedural rules. *In re Marriage of Williams*, 219 Ariz. 546, ¶ 13, 200 P.3d 1043, 1046 (App. 2008).

¶3 Given Valenzuela’s failure to establish appellate jurisdiction in accordance with Rule 13, the appeal is dismissed.