

OPINION SUMMARY

MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS EASTERN DISTRICT

DIVISION THREE

CITY OF ST. LOUIS,)	No. ED102668
)	
Respondent,)	Appeal from the Circuit Court
)	of the City of St. Louis
vs.)	1422-CR01277
)	
ROLAND HILL,)	Honorable Michael W. Noble
)	
Appellant.)	Filed: March 1, 2016

Roland Hill (“Appellant”) appeals the judgment of the Circuit Court of the City of St. Louis (“circuit court”), entered after a bench trial, finding him guilty of three municipal ordinance violations for failing to comply with the property maintenance code of the City of St. Louis (“the City”) and sentencing him to pay a \$1,500 fine plus court costs. This matter was before the circuit court for a trial de novo following Appellant’s bench trial in the St. Louis City Municipal Division, where Appellant was found guilty of the same municipal ordinance violations¹ and was also sentenced to pay a fine plus court costs. The City has filed a motion to strike Appellant’s brief and dismiss his appeal, which was taken with the case. In addition, Appellant has filed a motion for plain error review, which was taken with the case.

APPEAL DISMISSED.

Division Three holds: It is Appellant’s duty to provide our Court with a complete record of the underlying proceedings, as it is necessary to determine the issues he raises on appeal. Because Appellant has failed to file a transcript of the underlying proceedings as required by Rule 30.04,² and because our Court cannot take judicial notice of or otherwise recognize the municipal ordinance of which Appellant was found guilty, we are unable to give meaningful review to Appellant’s claims of error. Accordingly, we partially grant the City’s motion taken with the case and dismiss Appellant’s appeal.³

¹ The municipal division also found Appellant guilty of a fourth municipal ordinance violation which was dismissed during the trial de novo.

² All references to Rules are to Missouri Supreme Court Rules (2015).

³ We grant the portion of the City’s motion taken with the case which requests our Court to dismiss Appellant’s appeal on the grounds the record on appeal fails to comply with Rule 30.04. However, we deny the portion of the City’s motion taken with the case which urges our Court to strike Appellant’s brief and to dismiss his appeal on the grounds Appellant’s brief fails to comply with Rules 30.06 and 84.04. We also deny Appellant’s motion for plain error review taken with the case.

Opinion by: Robert M. Clayton III, P.J.
Lawrence E. Mooney, J., and James M. Dowd, J., concur.

Attorney for Appellant: Roland Hill, Acting Pro Se

Attorney for Respondent: Erika E. Zaza

THIS SUMMARY IS NOT PART OF THE OPINION OF THE COURT. IT HAS BEEN PREPARED FOR THE CONVENIENCE OF THE READER AND SHOULD NOT BE QUOTED OR CITED.