Cite as 2012 Ark. App. 256

## ARKANSAS COURT OF APPEALS

DIVISION I No. CA11-941

Opinion Delivered April 18, 2012

JOE RYBURN

APPELLANT

APPEAL FROM THE SALINE
COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT

[No. DR-04-653-1]

V.

HONORABLE BOBBY D. McCALLISTER, JUDGE

JANET CAROL RYBURN

LLEE REBRIEFING ORDERED

**APPELLEE** 

## LARRY D. VAUGHT, Chief Judge

Appellant Joe Ryburn brings this pro se appeal from an order of the Saline County Circuit Court awarding appellee Janet Ryburn a \$104,000 judgment based on Mr. Ryburn's failure to make mortgage payments on the parties' marital home and a separate order finding appellant's child-support obligation to be \$1218.30 per month. We do not reach the merits of appellant's case because of his failure to comply with our abstract, brief, and addendum requirements.

Our rules clearly state that the addendum shall contain documents in the record on appeal that are essential for the appellate court to confirm its jurisdiction, to understand the case, and to decide the issues on appeal. Ark. Sup. Ct. R. 4–2(a)(8)(2011). This includes all pleadings, motions, and exhibits that are necessary for an understanding of the issues on appeal. Additionally, the abstract of the transcript of the hearing must be presented in the first person. Ark. Sup. Ct. R. 4–2(a)(5). Because of deficiencies in his brief, we hereby order rebriefing and direct Mr. Ryburn to file a substituted brief that complies with our rules. Ark.

## Cite as 2012 Ark. App. 256



Sup. Ct. R. 4-2(b)(3) (allowing parties who file a deficient brief an opportunity to file a conforming brief). The substituted brief, abstract, and addendum shall be due fifteen days from the date of this order. After service of the substituted abstract, brief, and addendum, the appellee shall have an opportunity to revise or supplement her brief in the time prescribed by the court.

We remind Mr. Ryburn that appellants, even those who proceed pro se, are responsible for following the rules of appellate procedure, and pro se litigants are held to the same standards as attorneys. *Perry v. State*, 287 Ark. 384, 699 S.W.2d 739 (1985); *Walker v. State*, 283 Ark. 339, 676 S.W.2d 460 (1984). Therefore, Mr. Ryburn should carefully review the rules to ensure that his substituted brief is compliant and without other deficiencies, regardless of whether they are listed above. If Mr. Ryburn fails to file a compliant brief within fifteen days, the decision of the circuit court may be summarily affirmed for noncompliance with our rules. Ark. Sup. Ct. R. 4–2(c)(2).

Rebriefing ordered.

GLADWIN and WYNNE, JJ., agree.

*Joe D. Ryburn*, pro se appellant.

Jensen, Young & Houston, PLLC, by: Terence C. Jensen, for appellee.