## ARKANSAS COURT OF APPEALS

DIVISION IV **No.** CA 11–557

**DORIS SCOTT** 

**APPELLANT** 

V.

POTLATCH FOREST PRODUCTS CORPORATION, SELF-INSURED EMPLOYER

MANAGEMENT CLAIM SOLUTIONS (TPA), INSURANCE CARRIER APPELLEES

Opinion Delivered January 25, 2012

APPEAL FROM THE ARKANSAS WORKERS' COMPENSATION COMMISSION [NO. F605860]

**AFFIRMED** 

## WAYMOND M. BROWN, Judge

This is an appeal from an April 5, 2011 decision by the Arkansas Workers' Compensation Commission denying the claims of appellant, Doris Scott, with regard to injuries allegedly arising from a work-related injury on May 25, 2006. However, we are unable to reach the merits of Ms. Scott's appeal. To the extent that we can follow her argument, we observe that she has not cited any supporting legal authority. It is well established that this court will not consider the merits of an appeal if the appellant makes no convincing argument or cites no legal authority to support her argument. If an appellant's

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Hendrix v. Black, 373 Ark. 266, 283 S.W.3d 590 (2008).



## Cite as 2012 Ark. App. 92

point is not apparent without further research, we will not hear the matter.<sup>2</sup> We simply will not address issues on appeal that are not appropriately developed.<sup>3</sup>

We are aware that Ms. Scott is representing herself in this matter; however, pro se appellants are responsible for following the rules of the court and the rules of appellate procedure, and are held to the same standards as attorneys in preparing their briefs.<sup>4</sup> Failure to develop a legal issue for this court's consideration is cause to affirm.<sup>5</sup>

Affirmed.

GRUBER and MARTIN, JJ., agree.

 $<sup>^{2}</sup>Id.$ 

 $<sup>^{3}</sup>Id.$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>Moon v. Holloway, 353 Ark. 520, 110 S.W.3d 250 (2003); Perry v. State, 287 Ark. 384, 699 S.W.2d 739 (1985); Walker v. State, 283 Ark. 339, 676 S.W.2d 460 (1984).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>See In re Adoption of D.J.L., 341 Ark. 327, 16 S.W.3d 263 (2000).