

**MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS  
WESTERN DISTRICT**

---

COMPLETE TITLE OF CASE:

BRYAN KRANTZ,

Appellant

v.

JACKSON COUNTY, MISSOURI.

Respondent

---

DOCKET NUMBER WD78307

**MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS  
WESTERN DISTRICT**

DATE: May 17, 2016

---

Appeal From:

Circuit Court of Jackson County, MO  
The Honorable James P. Williams, Judge

---

Appellate Judges:

Division Three  
Gary D. Witt, P.J., James Edward Welsh, and Anthony Rex Gabbert, JJ.

---

Attorneys:

Lynne Bratcher, Kansas City, MO  
Marie Gockel, Kansas City, MO

Counsel for Appellant  
Co-Counsel for Appellant

---

Attorneys:

Paul Seyferth, Kansas City, MO  
Nickalaus Seacord, Kansas City, MO

Counsel for Respondent  
Co-Counsel for Respondent

---

**MISSOURI APPELLATE COURT OPINION SUMMARY  
MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS, WESTERN DISTRICT**

**BRYAN KRANTZ, Appellant, v.  
JACKSON COUNTY, MISSOURI, Respondent**

**WD78307**

**Jackson County**

Before Division Three Judges: Witt, P.J., Welsh, and Gabbert, JJ.

Krantz appeals the circuit court's denial of his motion for new trial in his action seeking damages against Jackson for intentionally engaging in unlawful retaliation against him in violation of the Missouri Human Rights Act. He contends that the circuit court abused its discretion in denying his motion for new trial when (1) "it excluded all evidence from independent witnesses, including from Judge [Jack] Grate, that showed Plaintiff was truthful to Judge Grate during the hearing that Defendant claimed was the basis for Plaintiff's termination, but allowed Defendant and its management employees to offer opinions that Plaintiff had lied to Judge Grate;" (2) "it excluded evidence of other prosecutors' misconduct for which the other prosecutors received no discipline;" and (3) "it excluded evidence of [his immediate supervisor's] personal animus toward Plaintiff." Krantz contends that all of this excluded evidence is "circumstantial evidence of retaliation."

**Appeal Dismissed.**

**Division Three holds:**

(1) The denial of a motion for new trial is not an appealable order.

(2) Because of the numerous deficiencies with Krantz's appeal, we dismiss Krantz's appeal. In his statement of facts in his brief on appeal, Krantz, does not identify where in the record the circuit court made the erroneous rulings about which he complains. His points relied on are multifarious and preserve nothing for appellate review. In the argument portion of his brief, Krantz provides no citations to the record where the alleged erroneous rulings of the circuit court occurred. In his second point relied on, Krantz does not even attempt to identify the pertinent facts or apply the law to the facts. Finally, Krantz fails to explain how the circuit court's rulings excluding the evidence materially affected the outcome of the trial. It is not the function of the appellate court to serve as advocate for any party to an appeal.

Opinion by James Edward Welsh, Judge

May 17, 2016

\* \* \* \* \*

**THIS SUMMARY IS UNOFFICIAL AND SHOULD NOT BE QUOTED OR CITED.**