MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS
WESTERN DISTRICT

JOY GUGLIELMINO,

Appellant,

v.

JACKSON COUNTY, MISSOURI,

Respondent.

DOCKET NUMBER WD82855

Date: July 28, 2020

Appeal from:

Jackson County Circuit Court
The Honorable Jalilah Otto, Judge

Appellate Judges:

Division Two: Mark D. Pfeiffer, P.J., and Alok Ahuja and Gary D. Witt, JJ.

Attorneys:

Joy Guglielmino, Kansas City, Missouri, appellant pro se

Tara L. Moreland, Kansas City, Missouri, for respondent

MISSOURI APPELLATE COURT OPINION SUMMARY

MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS
WESTERN DISTRICT

JOY GUGLIELMINO, Appellant,
v.
JACKSON COUNTY, MISSOURI, Respondent.

WD82855 Jackson County

Before Division Two Judge: Mark D. Pfeiffer, P.J., and Alok Ahuja and Gary D. Witt, JJ.

Joy Guglielmino filed suit in the Circuit Court of Jackson County against the County and against an attorney in the County Counselor's office. Guglielmino alleged that the judgment entered in a separate case, which confirmed the sale of certain real property for delinquent taxes, was void and should be set aside. The circuit court dismissed Guglielmino's petition for failure to state a claim on which relief could be granted, noting that she had failed to timely appeal from the judgment confirming the tax sale. Guglielmino appeals.

APPEAL DISMISSED.

Division Two holds:

Guglielmino's brief violates the procedural requirements of Rule 84.04 in multiple respects: the fact statement of her brief is argumentative, incomplete, and insufficiently supported by record citations; her Points Relied On are in many cases multifarious, and do not concisely explain why the legal principles on which she relies establish reversible error in the context of this case; and the argument section of her brief fails to identify where she preserved her appellate arguments in the circuit court, and fails to explain how the general principles of law which she cites interact with the facts of this case to support reversal.

While we sometimes exercise our discretion to review the merits of issues raised in a deficient brief, we do so only where the argument is readily understandable. Guglielmino's brief does not satisfy this standard.

Apart from its procedural deficiencies, Guglielmino's brief is also substantively deficient, because it fails to challenge the basis on which the circuit court ruled against her in this case: that she should have directly appealed the judgment entered in the land tax case, and that she was not entitled to collaterally attack that judgment in this separate proceeding.

Opinion by: Alok Ahuja, Judge **July 28, 2020**

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