

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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 TWO

ABULGHASEN AHMADPOUR,

Plaintiff and Appellant,

v.

HAMID MOAYER et al.,

Defendants and Respondents.

B228867

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. LC073144)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County.  
James A. Kaddo, Judge. Affirmed.

Abulghasen Ahmadpour, in pro. per.; B. Kwaku Duren & Associates and  
B. Kwaku Duren, for Plaintiff and Appellant.

Hausmann & Goldstone and Edwin D. Hausmann for Defendants and  
Respondents.

\* \* \* \* \*

Plaintiff and appellant Abulghasen Ahmadpour<sup>1</sup> appeals from the judgment dismissing his second amended complaint against defendants and respondents Hamid Moayer, Pari Moayer and WEBTD.COM, following the trial court's order granting respondents' motion for judgment on the pleadings. We affirm.

“A judgment or order of the lower court is *presumed correct*. All intendments and presumptions are indulged to support it on matters as to which the record is silent, and error must be affirmatively shown. This is not only a general principle of appellate practice but an ingredient of the constitutional doctrine of reversible error.” (*Denham v. Superior Court* (1970) 2 Cal.3d 557, 564; *Hernandez v. California Medical Center* (2000) 78 Cal.App.4th 498, 502.) Appellant has failed to meet his burden on appeal to affirmatively show trial court error.

While appellant has provided a 10-volume clerk's transcript that contains respondents' motion for judgment on the pleadings and the trial court's minute order following the hearing on the motion, the record does not contain any opposition to this motion by appellant or a reporter's transcript of the hearing. Although appellant filed a motion to augment the record on appeal, we denied this motion. It is not clear if appellant sought to include his opposition to the motion for judgment on the pleadings in the motion to augment.

Rule 8.204 of the California Rules of Court requires all appellate briefs to “[s]upport any reference to a matter in the record by a citation to the volume and page number of the record where the matter appears.” (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.204(a)(1)(C).) It is well established that “[i]f a party fails to support an argument with the necessary citations to the record, . . . the argument [will be] deemed to have been waived. [Citation.]” (*Nwosu v. Uba* (2004) 122 Cal.App.4th 1229, 1246.) Because appellant failed to provide an adequate record, he has no relevant evidence to cite, and therefore has failed to demonstrate trial court error.

---

<sup>1</sup> Appellant appeared in propria persona throughout the filing and briefing of this appeal. On February 29, 2012, an attorney substituted in and appeared at oral argument.

Additionally, California Rules of Court, rule 8.204(a)(1)(B) provides that each point in an appellate brief must be supported by argument and, if possible, by citation of authority. Although appellant's lengthy opening brief contains pages of citations to legal authorities, appellant fails to apply the law to the facts of this case in any coherent manner. Appellant's arguments are unintelligible and generally are quotes from strings of cases, statutes and other documents. "When an issue is unsupported by pertinent or cognizable legal argument it may be deemed abandoned and discussion by the reviewing court is unnecessary." (*Landry v. Berryessa Union School Dist.* (1995) 39 Cal.App.4th 691, 699–700.) Accordingly, as a consequence of appellant's failure to properly present his arguments on appeal, we deem his contentions to be forfeited, and do not address them. (*Evans v. Centerstone Development Co.* (2005) 134 Cal.App.4th 151, 165.)

The fact that appellant has been representing himself does not exempt him from these mandatory appellate requirements. Litigants appearing in propria persona are not entitled to special exemptions from the California Rules of Court or the Code of Civil Procedure and are held to the same standard as a litigant represented by counsel. (*Gamet v. Blanchard* (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 1276, 1284; *Nwosu v. Uba, supra*, 122 Cal.App.4th at pp. 1246–1247.)

## **DISPOSITION**

The judgment is affirmed. Respondents are entitled to recover their costs on appeal.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS.

\_\_\_\_\_, Acting P. J.

DOI TODD

We concur:

\_\_\_\_\_, J.

ASHMANN-GERST

\_\_\_\_\_, J.

CHAVEZ