IN THE HUALAPAI NATION COURT OF APPEALS HUALAPAI RESERVATION, ARIZONA

7	ROBERT BRAVO, JR.,)
8	Appellant,	App. Court Case No.: 2012-AP-004 Trial Court Case No.: 2011-CV-056
9	v.	
0	WAYLON HONGA, VICTOR	ORDER DISMISSING APPEAL
1	INGRAM,	
2	Appellees.	
- 1		

Appellant Robert Bravo, Jr., through his advocate Thomas A. Grover, filed a notice of appeal in this case on February 27, 2012. On that same day, Mr. Grover filed a notice of appearance stating that he would be acting as counsel of record for Appellant. This Court issued a Scheduling Order on April 17, 2012 in this appeal requiring Appellant to file an opening brief on or before April 27, 2012. Since that time, Appellant has not filed any brief or other pleading with the Court in this appeal.

The Hualapai Court of Appeals Rules of Appellate Procedure require parties who are represented by Tribal Court advocates to file briefs in all appeals. "Parties who are represented by professionally licensed attorneys or lay advocates are required to file briefs." Rule 11(b). Briefs are necessary to allow this Court and opposing parties the opportunity to properly prepare for and address all arguments raised in any appeal.

This requirement exists to ensure that opposing parties are adequately informed of the arguments to which they must respond, and that this Court is assisted in conducting its review. If an appellant files no brief, the appellee and this Court have only the Notice of Appeal. Yet under Rule 6(a)(i)(1) of the Rules of Appellate Procedure, the Notice of Appeal need only contain "a concise statement of the basis for [requesting appellate relief]," and "does not need to include an indepth argument." Indeed, this Rule specifies that "a full argument can be supplied in the appellant's brief." Talieje's Notice of Appeal in this case provided only a brief listing of "alleged errors made by the Trial Court." This short statement of alleged errors was insufficient, by itself, to supply the basis for opposing arguments or to assist this court.

Hualpai Tribe v. Talieje, App. Ct. Case No. 2011-AP-006, Order Dismissing Appeal (Aug. 9, 2011).

2 3

1

4

5

6

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

Here Appellant filed a notice of appeal that provided short statements of the issues raised for the appeal. This met the requirements of Appellate Court Rule 6(a)(i)(1). However more detail was needed through a brief to provide notice to the Court and the opposing parties of the full extent of the issues on appeal. Appellant specifically stated in his notice of appeal that he did not provide sufficient detail on the issues to be addressed. He stated, "BRAVO argues that the Trial Court erred when it ignored his right to be heard before an impartial party and that there were several relevant issues of Hualapai law and procedure that were overlooked and there assignment of error would have altered the outcome of this matter, which he reserves the right to raise these issues at a later date. BRAVO is currently waiting for audio recordings of the hearing in this matter." Appellant's Notice of Appeal at p. 3. Appellant appears to be stating that he needs to review the audio recordings of the hearing before he can provide more detail of his arguments on appeal. Once Appellant refined his arguments, he needed to present them to the Court and the opposing parties by stating them in a brief that he was required to file with the Court. Appellant failed to do so.

Appellant has not filed any pleading with the Court following the issuance of the Scheduling Order. He did not request any type of continuance. Based on Appellant's failure to prosecute this matter in accordance with this Court's rules, this appeal is hereby dismissed. The hearing scheduled for this appeal on June 15, 2012 is cancelled.

IT IS SO ORDERED

WES WILLIAMS JR. CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE

HUALAPAI COURT OF APPEALS

Dated: June 12, 2012.