

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

CHARLES HOLLLOM,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

TERESA ARASHEBEN,

Defendant and Appellant.

B271003

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. LS027368)

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Alicia Blanco, Judge. Affirmed.

Teresa Arasheben, in pro. per., for Defendant and Appellant.

Charles Hollom, in pro. per. No appearance by Plaintiff and Respondent.

In this appeal from the issuance of a civil harassment restraining order, appellant Teresa Arasheben presents general challenges to the manner in which the hearing was conducted, and to the trial court's credibility determinations. Appellant presents no legal grounds for her appeal; we affirm.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Respondent Charles Hollom filed a request for a civil restraining order against Teresa Arasheben on December 11, 2015. The court issued a temporary restraining order on that date, setting a hearing for December 30. Due to service of process issues, that hearing date was continued, and the temporary order extended, on two occasions.

Arasheben filed a detailed response on January 20, 2016; she also appears to have filed her own request for a restraining order against Hollom, although that document is not in the record before this court. Both parties appeared for the hearing on March 3, 2016; the court heard testimony from both parties and admitted exhibits proffered by Hollom. The court found that Hollom had sustained his burden of proof, and issued a restraining order.¹

¹ The court also found that Arasheben had not met her burden of proof, dissolved the temporary order issued in her case, and dismissed that case. Arasheben has filed no appeal in that matter.

DISCUSSION

Arasheben filed a timely appeal, but her brief on appeal identifies no legal issues supported by citation to legal authority. Her primary arguments center on her disagreement with the trial court's determination of credibility.

As an appellant, Arasheben has failed to meet her burden to demonstrate error in the trial court by reasoned argument and appropriate citation to the record and relevant legal authority. Merely stating that the trial court erred is insufficient to present an issue for review. "This is no legal analysis at all. It is simply a conclusion, unsupported by any explanation" of asserted error. (*In re S.C.* (2006) 138 Cal.App.4th 396, 410; *Okorie v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist.* (2017) 14 Cal.App.5th 574, 599-600 [appellant has burden to present legal authority for all arguments made].)

As a result, we need not review her claims further: "When an issue is unsupported by pertinent or cognizable legal argument it may be deemed abandoned and discussion by the reviewing court is unnecessary. [Citations.]" (*Landry v. Berryessa Union School Dist.* (1995) 39 Cal.App.4th 691, 699-700.)

Moreover, issues of credibility are committed to the trier of fact. We reverse on the basis of credibility determinations only if appellant demonstrates that the evidence is inherently improbable or implausible; "it is the exclusive province of the [trier of fact] to determine the credibility of a witness and the truth or falsity of the facts upon which a determination depends." (*Evje v. City Title Ins. Co.* (1953) 120 Cal.App.2d 488, 492.) Ultimately, the test is "whether it is reasonable for

a trier of fact to make the ruling in question in light of the record.” (*Roddenberry v. Roddenberry* (1996) 44 Cal.App.4th 634, 652 citing *Kuhn v. Department of General Services* (1994) 22 Cal.App.4th 1627, 1633.) The record of proceedings in this case, which we have reviewed, demonstrates that it was reasonable for the trial court to make the determinations on which the ruling depends.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

ZELON, J.

We concur:

PERLUSS, P. J.

BENSINGER, J.*

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