

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

---

ABOU G. BOURAIMA,  
*Petitioner Employee,*

*v.*

THE INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION OF ARIZONA,  
*Respondent,*

TOHONO O'ODHAM NURSING CARE AUTHORITY,  
*Respondent Employer,*

COPPERPOINT WESTERN INSURANCE COMPANY,  
*Respondent Insurer.*

No. 2 CA-IC 2015-0002  
Filed August 26, 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NOT FOR PUBLICATION  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).*

---

Special Action - Industrial Commission  
ICA Claim No. 20130770412  
Insurer No. 13W00389  
Jacqueline Wohl, Administrative Law Judge

**AWARD AFFIRMED**

---

BOURAIMA v. INDUS. COMM'N OF ARIZ.  
Decision of the Court

COUNSEL

Abou G. Bouraima, Tucson  
*In Propria Persona*

The Industrial Commission of Arizona, Phoenix  
By Andrew F. Wade  
*Counsel for Respondent*

Copperpoint Western Insurance Company, Tucson  
James B. Stabler, Chief Counsel  
By Joseph N. Lodge  
*Counsel for Respondent Employer and Insurer*

---

**MEMORANDUM DECISION**

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

---

ECKERSTROM, Chief Judge:

¶1 In this statutory special action, petitioner employee Abou Bouraima challenges the decision of the administrative law judge (ALJ) finding his medical condition stable and stationary, with no permanent impairment or need for supportive care, and closing his claim. We have jurisdiction to review the ALJ's award and decision pursuant to A.R.S. §§ 12-120.21(A)(2) and 23-951, as well as Rule 10, Ariz. R. P. Spec. Actions.

¶2 On review, Bouraima has not presented this court with clear issues or arguments that are supported by any legal authority, as required by Rule 13(a)(6) and (7), Ariz. R. Civ. App. P., and Rule 10(k), Ariz. R. P. Spec. Actions. He claims, for example, that he "strongly disagree[s] with] a decision [of] the insurance physician" and that certain "body language show[ed] the partiality" of the ALJ. "Parties who choose to represent themselves 'are entitled to no more consideration than if they had been represented by counsel' and are

BOURAIMA v. INDUS. COMM'N OF ARIZ.

Decision of the Court

held to the same standards as attorneys with respect to ‘familiarity with required procedures and . . . notice of statutes and local rules.’” *In re Marriage of Williams*, 219 Ariz. 546, ¶ 13, 200 P.3d 1043, 1046 (App. 2008), quoting *Smith v. Rabb*, 95 Ariz. 49, 53, 386 P.2d 649, 652 (1963). In the absence of a properly developed argument, we find any issue related to the award waived on review. See *Polanco v. Indus. Comm’n*, 214 Ariz. 489, n.2, 154 P.3d 391, 393 n.2 (App. 2007).

¶3           The award and decision are affirmed.