

IN THE
ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

ALEX GARCIA,
Petitioner Employee,

v.

THE INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION OF ARIZONA,
Respondent,

WHOLESUM FARMS ARIZONA, LLC,
Respondent Employer,

COPPERPOINT GENERAL INSURANCE COMPANY,
Respondent Insurer.

No. 2 CA-IC 2015-0016
Filed May 23, 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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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. Actions 10(k).*

Special Action - Industrial Commission
ICA Claim No. 20143580170
Insurer No. 13G03087
Gary M. Israel, Administrative Law Judge

AWARD AFFIRMED

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

COUNSEL

Alex Garcia, Tucson
In Propria Persona

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

Copperpoint General Insurance Company, Tucson
Mark A. Kendall, Associate General Counsel
By Joseph N. Lodge
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.

ECKERSTROM, Chief Judge:

¶1 In this statutory special action, petitioner employee Alex Garcia challenges the decision of the administrative law judge (ALJ) finding his claim was barred because he failed to file it in a timely manner. 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, 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. Actions. He has also failed to include "references to the portions of the record on which [he] relies." Ariz. R. Civ. App. P. 13(a)(7)(A). "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

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

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 decision 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 decision of the ALJ.