

Cite as 2024 Ark. App. 343  
**ARKANSAS COURT OF APPEALS**  
DIVISION IV  
No. CV-22-155

ADVANTAGE PROPERTY  
MANAGEMENT

APPELLANT

V.

CHRISTOPHER BURKARD

APPELLEE

Opinion Delivered May 29, 2024

APPEAL FROM THE FAULKNER  
COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT  
[NO. 23CV-19-1615]

HONORABLE CHARLES E.  
CLAWSON III, JUDGE

AFFIRMED

---

**BART F. VIRDEN, Judge**

A Faulkner County jury rendered a verdict in favor of appellee Christopher Burkard in his lawsuit for breach of contract and breach of fiduciary duty against appellant Advantage Property Management (“APM”). Burkard was awarded both compensatory and punitive damages in connection with his lawsuit. The appeal from that decision is the subject of a companion case, *Advantage Property Management v. Burkard*, 2024 Ark. App. 342, \_\_\_ S.W.3d \_\_\_, also handed down today. In this appeal, APM argues that the trial court’s award of attorney’s fees in the amount of \$59,610 should be overturned if the underlying judgment in the companion case is reversed.<sup>1</sup> We affirm.

---

<sup>1</sup>The trial court denied APM’s motion for relief from the judgment pursuant to Ark. R. Civ. P. 60. APM concedes on appeal that the trial court did not have sufficient grounds

APM argues that, if we reverse the underlying judgment in the companion case, 2024 Ark. App. 342, \_\_\_ S.W.3d \_\_\_, we should also reverse the award of attorney’s fees to Burkard. Because we affirm the underlying judgment on direct appeal in the companion case, we likewise affirm the award of attorney’s fees in this separate appeal. APM’s argument on appeal has essentially been rendered moot by our decision in the companion case. See *Worden v. Crow*, 2013 Ark. App. 234, 427 S.W.3d 143.

Affirmed.

GLADWIN and HIXSON, JJ., agree.

*Taylor & Taylor Law Firm, P.A.*, by: *Andrew M. Taylor* and *Tasha C. Taylor*, for appellant/cross-appellee.

*Quattlebam, Grooms & Tull PLLC*, by: *Thomas H. Wyatt* and *Meredith A. Powell*, for appellee/cross-appellant.

---

to set aside the judgment in favor of Burkard and, therefore, abandons that aspect of its appeal. Arguments not raised on appeal are waived. *Baker v. State*, 2010 Ark. App. 843.