

ARKANSAS COURT OF APPEALS

DIVISION II
No. CA11-628

JOHN L. HANSEN

APPELLANT

V.

WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A., ET AL.

APPELLEES

Opinion Delivered May 16, 2012

APPEAL FROM THE PULASKI
COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT,
FIFTH DIVISION
[NO. CV-10-6733]

HONORABLE WENDELL GRIFFEN,
JUDGE

AFFIRMED

WAYMOND M. BROWN, Judge

John Hansen brings a pro se appeal from orders dismissing his claims against appellees Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., Wells Fargo Home Mortgage, Countrywide Home Loans, Inc., Wilson & Associates, P.L.L.C., Iberiabank, and Bank of the West. We affirm.

Hansen gave a deed of trust on real property to secure a loan from Iberiabank's predecessor, Pulaski Mortgage Company. The loan was assigned to Commercial Federal Mortgage Corporation (now Bank of the West); Commercial Federal assigned its interest to Wells Fargo Bank. After Wells Fargo and Countrywide began foreclosure, Hansen sued Wells Fargo, Iberiabank, and others in federal court, which dismissed that complaint as frivolous. Hansen filed a second action in the Pulaski County Circuit Court, Case No. CV 10-2646, against individuals associated with Wells Fargo, Iberiabank, Bank of the West, and Countrywide. He also sued Matthew Smith, an attorney with Wilson & Associates, P.L.L.C.,



which had begun foreclosure. The court dismissed Hansen’s claims against Smith with prejudice; it dismissed the other claims for lack of jurisdiction and failure to set forth sufficient facts to entitle him to relief. Hansen then filed this action against appellees concerning the same events, and appellees moved to dismiss. Taking notice of Case No. CV 10-2646, the court dismissed the claims against Iberiabank and Bank of the West on the basis of the statute of limitations; dismissed the claims against Wilson & Associates on the basis of res judicata; and dismissed the claims against Wells Fargo and Countrywide on the basis of Arkansas Rules of Civil Procedure 8(a) and 12(b)(6).

Hansen’s appellate brief is so utterly incomprehensible that we must affirm.¹ In fact, “it is an incoherent conglomeration of statements and arguments which cannot be fairly characterized as a legal brief.”² Pro se appellants are held to the same standards as attorneys in preparing their briefs, and an appellant’s failure to provide an intelligible brief is cause to affirm.³

Affirmed.

VAUGHT, C.J., and MARTIN, J., agree.

John Lee Hansen, pro se appellant.

Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, PC, by: *Blair B. Evans*, for appellee Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. and Countrywide Home Loans, Inc.

Wilson & Associates, PLLC, by: *Angela M. Martin*, for appellee Wilson & Associates, PLLC.

Marshall & Owens, P.A., by: *W. Lance Owens* and *James F. Gramling, Jr.*, for appellee IberiaBank.

¹See *McNeil v. Weiss*, 2011 Ark. 46, 378 S.W.3d 133.

² *Widmer v. Taylor*, 296 Ark. 337, 338, 756 S.W.2d 903 (1988); see also *Satterlee v. State*, 289 Ark. 450, 711 S.W.2d 827 (1986).

³ *Scott v. Potlatch Forest Prods. Corp.*, 2012 Ark. App. 92.