NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION FIVE

ANGELA D. STEVENSON,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

RENARD A. STEVENSON, COURTNEY G. STEVENSON, AND DEBORAH P. WASHINGTON

Defendants and Appellants.

B268694

(Los Angeles County Super. Ct. No. TC027839)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, William Barry. Affirmed.

Renard A. Stevenson, in pro per., for Defendant and Appellant Renard A. Stevenson.

Courtney A. Stevenson, in pro per., for Defendant and Appellant Courtney A. Stevenson.

Deborah P. Washington, in pro per., for Defendant and Appellant Deborah P. Washington.

Angela D. Stevenson, in pro per., for Plaintiff and Respondent Angela D. Stevenson.

INTRODUCTION

Defendants and appellants appeal from a judgment entered after a court trial. Due to the inadequacy of the record on appeal, we affirm.

BACKGROUND

The parties are all siblings who jointly inherited a home from their mother after she passed away in 1995. In 2014, plaintiff and respondent Angela D. Stevenson filed an action against her other three siblings seeking a partition of the property and an accounting. The parties settled the partition aspect of the action, but the dispute over an accounting led to a court trial over two days, August 28 and 31, 2015.

On September 1, 2015, the trial court issued a written decision after court trial. Among other things, the trial court concluded that plaintiff was entitled to receive \$199 from defendant Deborah P. Washington, that judgment should be entered in favor of plaintiff as against defendant Washington, and that judgment should be entered in favor of defendants Renard A. Stevenson and Courtney A. Stevenson as against plaintiff.

On October 2, 2015, the trial court entered judgment in accordance with its written decision, leaving blank the amounts

that might be awarded as costs to the prevailing parties, respectively. Defendants timely appealed.

DISCUSSION

We affirm the trial court's decision because defendants have failed to provide an adequate record that would allow us to evaluate any of their claims on appeal.

As the parties who brought this appeal, defendants have the burden of providing an adequate record. (*Maria P. v. Riles* (1987) 43 Cal.3d 1281, 1295.) Here, defendants have not done so. The record does not include the reporter's transcript of the trial or other suitable substitute. Defendants Washington and Renard A. Stevenson explain that there was no court reporter during trial because the trial court did not supply one. But it was up to the parties—not the trial court—to provide a court reporter if

California Rules of Court, rule 3.1700(a)(1) provides: "A prevailing party who claims costs [of suit] must serve and file a memorandum of costs within 15 days after the date of service of the notice of entry of judgment or dismissal by the clerk under Code of Civil Procedure section 664.5 or the date of service of written notice of entry of judgment or dismissal, or within 180 days after entry of judgment, whichever is first. The memorandum of costs must be verified by a statement of the party, attorney, or agent that to the best of his or her knowledge the items of cost are correct and were necessarily incurred in the case. Allowable costs of suit include such things as costs for filing fees, deposition transcripts, and jury food and lodging. (Code of Civ. Pro., § 1033.5) A party may, in turn, file a motion seeking to strike or "tax" the costs sought. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.1700(b)(1) & (2).) The record, however, does not include a memorandum of costs, or any indication that the trial court determined the amount of costs to be awarded.

they desired a transcription of the proceedings. Even absent a reporter's transcript, defendants could have, but did not, obtain an agreed statement or settled statement to substitute for a reporter's transcript. (Cal. Rules of Court, rules 8.134, 8.137.)

The failure to provide an adequate record on an issue requires that the issue be resolved against the party appealing from that issue. (*Maria P. v. Riles, supra*, 43 Cal.3d at pp. 1295-1296.) Without the reporter's transcript or suitable substitute, we cannot review any of the matters raised by defendants in their respective appeals and instead must affirm the trial court's judgment. (*Hotels Nevada, LLC v. L.A. Pacific Center, Inc.* (2012) 203 Cal.App.4th 336, 348 ["By failing to provide an adequate record, appellant cannot meet his burden to show error and we must resolve any challenge to the order against him. [Citation.]".])

DISPOSITION

Affirmed. Plaintiff is awarded her costs on appeal.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

		KIN, J.*
We concur:		
	TURNER, P. J.	

KRIEGLER, J.

^{*} Judge of the Superior Court of the County of Los Angeles, assigned by the Chief Justice pursuant to article VI, section 6 of the California Constitution.