

**ARKANSAS COURT OF APPEALS**

DIVISION III  
No. CACR11-964

CHARLES LEE HANCOCK  
APPELLANT

V.

STATE OF ARKANSAS  
APPELLEE

Opinion Delivered March 7, 2012

APPEAL FROM THE GRANT  
COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT,  
[NO. CR-10-32-1]

HONORABLE CHRIS E WILLIAMS,  
JUDGE

REBRIEFING ORDERED

---

**WAYMOND M. BROWN, Judge**

Appellant Charles Hancock was found guilty of possession of a firearm by certain persons and sentenced to six-and-one-half years' imprisonment.<sup>1</sup> He argues on appeal that the evidence was insufficient to support his conviction. We are unable to address the merits of this argument, however, as Hancock has submitted a deficient brief.

Arkansas Supreme Court Rule 4-2(a)(8)(A)(i)<sup>2</sup> provides that the addendum must include, among other things, exhibits that are essential for this court to confirm its jurisdiction, to understand the case, and to decide the issue on appeal. Our rules also require the party making the addendum to seek a waiver of the addendum obligation if an exhibit cannot be

---

<sup>1</sup>This sentence was to run consecutive to the time he was already serving.

<sup>2</sup>(2011).



reproduced in the addendum.<sup>3</sup> In this case, counsel failed to include the video recording of the police stop in the addendum as required by our rules. Further, he failed to file a motion for waiver of the addendum obligation. Additionally, we are troubled that the brief's argument lacks development.<sup>4</sup>

We direct counsel to file a substituted brief that complies with our rules.<sup>5</sup> The substituted brief, abstract, and addendum shall be due fifteen days from the date of this order. We remind counsel that the examples we have noted are not to be taken as an exhaustive list of deficiencies. Counsel should carefully review the rules to ensure that no other deficiencies exist. Failure to file a compliant brief within fifteen days could result in the trial court's decision being summarily affirmed for noncompliance with our rules.<sup>6</sup>

Rebriefing ordered.

HART and HOOFFMAN, JJ., agree.

---

<sup>3</sup>Ark. Sup. Ct. R. 4-2(a)(8)(A)(ii).

<sup>4</sup>Counsel has failed to set out the standard of review with respect to a challenge to the sufficiency of the evidence and the elements of the offense charged.

<sup>5</sup>Ark. Sup. Ct. R. 4-2(b)(3).

<sup>6</sup>Ark. Sup. Ct. R. 4-2(c)(2).