

**Dismiss and Opinion Filed June 12, 2020**



**In The  
Court of Appeals  
Fifth District of Texas at Dallas**

---

**No. 05-19-00841-CV**

---

**REGINALD JONES, Appellant**

**V.**

**THE HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF DALLAS, TEXAS PARK  
MANOR, Appellee**

---

**On Appeal from the County Court at Law No. 5  
Dallas County, Texas  
Trial Court Cause No. CC-19-03357-E**

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Before Justices Bridges, Pedersen, III, and Evans  
Opinion by Justice Pedersen, III

Pro se appellant Reginald Jones appeals the trial court's judgment in favor of The Housing Authority of the City of Dallas, Texas Park Manor, appellee, in a dispute involving breach of housing lease and forcible detainer. We dismiss the appeal.

**I. BACKGROUND**

When Jones filed his brief on December 2, 2019, we determined that it was deficient. By letter dated December 10, 2019, we notified Jones that his brief failed to comply with requirements of Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 38.1, and we

provided him with a list of deficiencies to correct. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 38.1. We instructed Jones to file an amended brief that complied with Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 38.1's requirements within ten days and cautioned him that failure to comply might result in dismissal of his appeal without further notice. *See id.* 38.8(a)(1); 42.3(b), (c).

On December 18, 2019, Jones filed an amended brief, however, his amended brief also failed to comply with our briefing rules.

## II. ANALYSIS

Although civil litigants may represent themselves at trial and on appeal, pro se litigants must adhere to our rules of evidence and procedure, including the appellate rules of procedure. *Bolling v. Farmers Branch Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 315 S.W.3d 893, 895 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2010, no pet.). Our appellate rules have specific requirements for briefing. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 38. Among other requirements, the rules require appellants to state concisely their complaints; provide understandable, succinct, and clear argument showing why their complaints are meritorious in fact and in law; cite and apply applicable law; and provide appropriate references to the record. *See id.* 38.1(f–i); *Bolling*, 315 S.W.3d at 895. If an appellant fails to provide adequate briefing, we may dismiss the appeal. TEX. R. APP. P. 42.3; *Bolling*, 315 S.W.3d at 895–96. A brief that fails to comply with these requirements presents nothing for review. *Bolling*, 315 S.W.3d at 896–97.

We are not required to search the appellate record, with no guidance from the briefing party, to determine if the record supports the party's argument. *Pratt v. State*, 907 S.W.2d 38, 47 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1995, writ denied) (citing *Fredonia State Bank v. General Am. Life Ins. Co.*, 881 S.W.2d 279, 283 (Tex. 1994)). We also “know of no authority obligating us to become advocates for a particular litigant through performing their research and developing their argument for them.” *Tello v. Bank One, N.A.*, 218 S.W.3d 109, 116 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2007, no pet.) (internal quotation omitted). Thus, an appellant's failure to cite legal authority or provide substantive analysis of a legal issue results in waiver of the complaint. *Fredonia State Bank*, 881 S.W.2d at 284 (observing that error may be waived by inadequate briefing); *Huey v. Huey*, 200 S.W.3d 851, 854 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2006, no pet.).

Here, Jones failed to file a brief that complies with our briefing rules, despite being notified of his brief's deficiencies and having opportunity to amend. His amended brief fails to provide a concise statement of facts supported by record references or argument with appropriate citations to the record and legal authorities. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 38.1(g), (i).

### III. CONCLUSION

Without adequate briefing, especially the lack of support by reference to the record and authorities, Jones is not entitled to judicial review. *See* TEX. R. APP. P.

38.1(g), (i); *Bolling*, 315 S.W.3d at 895–96. Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal. See  
TEX. R. APP. P. 42.3(c).

/Bill Pedersen, III//  
\_\_\_\_\_  
BILL PEDERSEN, III  
JUSTICE

190841f.p05



**Court of Appeals  
Fifth District of Texas at Dallas**

**JUDGMENT**

REGINALD JONES, Appellant

No. 05-19-00841-CV      V.

THE HOUSING AUTHORITY OF  
THE CITY OF DALLAS, TEXAS  
PARK MANOR, Appellee

On Appeal from the County Court at  
Law No. 5, Dallas County, Texas  
Trial Court Cause No. CC-19-03357-  
E.

Opinion delivered by Justice  
Pedersen, III. Justices Bridges and  
Evans participating.

In accordance with this Court's opinion of this date, the appeal is  
**DISMISSED.**

Judgment entered this 12<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2020.