

ARKANSAS COURT OF APPEALS

DIVISION III

No. CA08-639

GREGORY SCOTT GOLDMAN
APPELLANT

V.

SANDRA L. GOLDMAN
APPELLEE

Opinion Delivered May 12, 2010

APPEAL FROM THE JEFFERSON
COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT
[NO. DR-2002-216-3]

HONORABLE WILLIAM BENTON,
JUDGE

AFFIRMED

JOHN MAUZY PITTMAN, Judge

This is an appeal from an order finding appellant in contempt for violations of previous decrees and orders entered in what appellant describes as a “vitriolic, litigious and convoluted divorce matter.” We affirm.

Appellant’s entire argument on appeal reads exactly as follows:

The applicable standard of review is argued to be de novo. (Pomraning v. Pomraning, 13 Ark. App. 258, 682 S.W.2d 755 (1985).

The Statement of the Case herein referencing pertinent elements of both subject Abstract and Addendum indicates, relative to A.C.A. 9-12-101 et seq.) that:

The Court erred in ruling Defendant in contempt.

The Court should Order a formal investigation of all the points alluded to during Appellant’s hearing relative to malfeasances and misfeasances by, and as specifically documented in the District Court’s Exhibits 1 and 2 (R 190-191 and A 25 and 26) and Defendant’s Exhibits 1 and 2 (R 251 and 252 and A 27

and 28), without limitation, the Court, Appellee, Appellee's Attorney, Appellant's prior attorney, including, without limitation, conspiracy between and/or among the aforementioned, and all other governmental and non-governmental parties. (Neal v. Neal, 258 Ark. 338, 524 S.W.2d 460 (1975).

The two-page statement of the case referenced in appellant's argument cites numerous pages of the abstract, hints at the nature of the order appealed from, and makes neither allegation nor argument that any specific error occurred. In a similar case involving an argument that was perhaps more coherent than that now before us, the esteemed Justice George Rose Smith wrote:

In effect the court is asked to research the law and to hold in favor of the appellant if the result of our labor so demands. We must decline that invitation. We adopt the position taken by the Supreme Court of Oklahoma in its own syllabus in *Irwin v. Irwin*, 416 P.2d 853 (1966): "Assignments of error presented by counsel in their brief, unsupported by convincing argument or authority, will not be considered on appeal, unless it is apparent without further research that they are well taken."

Dixon v. State, 260 Ark. 857, 862, 545 S.W.2d 606, 609 (1977). Here, appellant has merely made a general assertion of error without identifying any specific error he believes to have occurred or explaining why he believes the trial court was mistaken. An argument is not sufficient if it simply invites the court to search the record generally for errors. *Lavaca Telephone Co. v. Arkansas Public Service Commission*, 65 Ark. App. 263, 986 S.W.2d 146 (1999).

Affirmed.

HART and BAKER, JJ., agree.