

IN THE SUPREME COURT, STATE OF WYOMING

2010 WY 132

APRIL TERM, A.D. 2010

September 30, 2010

BASILE S. DASKALAKIS,

**Appellant
(Plaintiff),**

v.

**WILLIAM B. RESOR, BARBARA
HAUGE, LANCE JOHNSON,
ROBERT WRIGHTMAN, JOHN
RESOR, SNAKE RIVER RANCH
LLC, SNAKE RIVER ASSOCIATES,
L.P., and CRYSTAL SPRINGS
RANCH, INC.,**

**Appellees
(Defendants).**

S-10-0094

*Appeal from the District Court of Teton County
The Honorable Nancy J. Guthrie, Judge*

Representing Appellant:

Basile S. Daskalakis, *Pro se*

Representing Appellee:

Matthew E. Turner of Mullikin, Larson & Swift, LLC, Jackson, Wyoming

Before KITE, C.J., and GOLDEN, HILL, VOIGT, and BURKE, JJ.

NOTICE: This opinion is subject to formal revision before publication in Pacific Reporter Third. Readers are requested to notify the Clerk of the Supreme Court, Supreme Court Building, Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002, of any typographical or other formal errors so that correction may be made before final publication in the permanent volume.

GOLDEN, Justice.

[¶1] Appellant Basile S. Daskalakis, *pro se*, appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment to Appellees, who are named in the caption in this appeal, in Appellant's action below which asserted various claims against Appellees, including claims for personal injury, excess utility charges, wrongful termination of employment, and wrongful eviction. Although Appellees have responded to the substance of the appeal, to the extent they can make some sense of it, they raise a preliminary question concerning Appellant's failure to comply with the requirement of Rule 7.01(e)(2) of the Wyoming Rules of Appellate Procedure, that his brief contain a statement of the facts relevant to the issues presented for review with appropriate references to documents in the index of the transmitted record. We find that Appellees' question is well-taken. We have identified other instances of non-compliance with our appellate procedural rules in Appellant's brief, namely, his brief does not contain a table of cases alphabetically arranged and other authorities cited with references to the pages in the brief where they appear, W.R.A.P. 7.01(c); his brief does not contain any cogent argument and does not contain a concise statement of the applicable standard of review for each issue. W.R.A.P. 7.01(f)(1) and (2).

[¶2] The failure of Appellant to comply with these rule requirements is ground for such action as this Court deems appropriate, including affirmance of the district court's judgment. W.R.A.P. 1.03; *Nathan v. American Global University*, 2005 WY 64, 113 P.3d 32 (Wyo. 2005); *MTM v. State, Dep't of Family Services*, 2001 WY 61, 26 P.3d 1035 (Wyo. 2001); and *Hamburg v. Heilbrun*, 889 P.2d 967 (Wyo. 1995). Exercising our discretion under W.R.A.P. 1.03, we summarily affirm the district court's summary judgment order in favor of Appellees.