

IN THE
ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

ALICIA GARCIA,
Petitioner Employee,

v.

THE INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION OF ARIZONA,
Respondent,

REVELLE MANAGEMENT, LLC,
Respondent Employer,

TECHNOLOGY INSURANCE COMPANY,
Respondent Insurer.

No. 2 CA-IC 2015-0012
Filed June 10, 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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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);
Ariz. R. P. Spec. Act. 10(k).*

Special Action - Industrial Commission
ICA Claim No. 20142020628
Insurer No. 12655151
Jonathan Hauer, Administrative Law Judge

AWARD AFFIRMED

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

COUNSEL

Alicia Garcia, Casa Grande
In Propria Persona

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

Broening Oberg Woods & Wilson, P.C., Phoenix
By Jerry T. Collen and Kevin R. Myer
Counsel for Respondents Employer & Insurer

MEMORANDUM DECISION

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

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

¶1 In this statutory special action, petitioner employee Alicia Garcia challenges the decision of the administrative law judge (ALJ) finding her medical condition stationary, with no permanent impairment, and awarding her temporary disability benefits. 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. Act.

¶2 On review, Garcia 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. Act. She also has failed to provide "appropriate references to the portions of the record on which [she] relies." Ariz. R. Civ. App. P. 13(a)(7)(A). For factual support, her opening brief refers to various appended materials. Even if such a procedure were permitted in this division, Garcia's references fail to indicate whether and "where each item is located in the record."

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

Ariz. R. Civ. App. P. 13.1(a), (c)(1); *see* Ariz. R. Civ. App. P. 13(d). “Parties who choose to represent themselves ‘are entitled to no more consideration than if they had been represented by counsel’ and are 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 We affirm the award and decision of the ALJ.