In the
Missouri Court of Appeals
Western District

CHRISTINE HARRELSON,	)	
	)	
Appellant,	)	**WD88214**
	)	
V.	)	**OPINION FILED:**
	)	**JULY 28, 2026**
DAVID CULVER, ET AL,	)	
	)	
Respondents.	)	

Appeal from the Circuit Court of Sullivan County, Missouri
The Honorable Adam Lee Warren, Judge

Before Division One: Gary D. Witt, Presiding Judge, Mark D. Pfeiffer, Judge and Thomas N. Chapman, Judge

Christine Harrelson appeals from the judgment of the Circuit Court of Sullivan County, Missouri ("trial court"), quashing writs of executions levying personal property, holding Harrelson in contempt of court for her conduct, and permanently enjoining her from filing any civil actions or post-judgment civil actions in Sullivan County for a period of five years without the assistance of an attorney. On appeal, Harrelson claims that the trial court erred in: (1) holding Harrelson in contempt because the evidence was insufficient to establish a willful and intentional violation of a clear and specific court order; (2) characterizing Harrelson's conduct as extrajudicial and unlawful because Missouri statutes authorize judgment creditors to pursue execution of a levy through

clerk-issued writs, and the clerk issued writs in this case; (3) permanently quashing the writs of execution because no facial defect was found in the writs; and (4) imposing a permanent filing injunction against Harrelson because such a sweeping restriction violates due process and exceeds the court's inherent authority. We dismiss Harrelson's appeal as her brief does not conform to Rule 84.04[1] to such a degree that this Court cannot consider her claims without serving as her advocate.

Analysis[2]

Harrelson appears *pro se*, which she has the right to do. *Pearson v. Keystone Temporary Assignment Grp., Inc.*, 588 S.W.3d 546, 549 (Mo. App. E.D. 2019). This Court, however, may not assist Harrelson and create arguments on her behalf in her appeal. *Id.* *Pro se* litigants must comply with the Supreme Court Rules, including Rule 84.04, which prescribes the requirements for appellate briefing. *Acton v. Rahn*, 611 S.W.3d 897, 900-01 (Mo. App. W.D. 2020). Compliance with the Rule's requirements is mandatory for all appellants to guarantee that the Court does not become an advocate by speculating on facts and arguments that have not been made by the appellant. *R.M. v. King*, 671 S.W.3d 394, 397 (Mo. App. W.D. 2023). Appellate briefs must include: (1) a detailed table of contents; (2) a concise statement of the jurisdictional grounds; (3) a

[1] Unless otherwise indicated, all rule references are to the Missouri Court Rules (2025).

[2] This case and case number WD88213 address nearly identical issues. Both cases were brought by Appellant, and she filed nearly identical briefs in each case. The Respondents in the cases are different, but the trial court issued a single judgment addressing both underlying cases. Oral arguments for both cases were heard the same day and the opinions in both cases are handed down on the same date.

statement of facts; (4) the points relied on; (5) an argument; and (6) a short conclusion. Rule 84.04. Although this Court prefers to reach the merits of a case, excusing technical deficiencies in a brief, it will not consider a brief "so deficient that it fails to give notice to this Court and to the other parties as to the issue presented on appeal." *J.A.D. v. F.J.D.*, 978 S.W.2d 336, 338 (Mo. banc 1998); *see also Lexow v. Boeing Co.*, 643 S.W.3d 501, 505 (Mo. banc 2022). The briefing requirements of Rule 84 are equally applicable to parties represented by counsel and unrepresented parties. *Acton*, 611 S.W.3d at 900-901.

Harrelson's first brief was stricken due to non-compliance with Rule 84.04 by an Order from this Court that set forth the reasons for the brief being stricken and the particular violations of Rule 84.04 contained within the first brief. Harrelson filed an amended brief but failed to correct the briefing deficiencies and continued to fail to comply with the requirements of Rule 84.04. Rule 84.04(c) requires the statement of facts in an appellate brief to be "a fair and concise statement of the facts relevant to the questions presented for determination without argument." *Interest of S.R.W.*, 715 S.W.3d 223, 229 (Mo. App. W.D. 2025). A statement of facts that is "replete with argument" violates Rule 84.04(c). *Murphy v. Steiner*, 658 S.W.3d 588, 593-94 (Mo. App. W.D. 2022). Harrelson's statement of facts, which spans over twenty pages, single spaced, is primarily argument with citations to legal authority that does not support her arguments, contained within the statement of facts.

Also, "[a]ll statements of facts shall have specific page references to the relevant part of the record on appeal, i.e., legal file, transcript, or exhibits." Rule 84.04(c). "The

primary purpose of the statement of facts is to afford an immediate, accurate, complete[,] and unbiased understanding of the facts of the case." *Murphy*, 658 S.W.3d at 593. Although Harrelson's amended brief does include some limited citations to the legal file, many of her alleged facts contain no references to the legal file. Instead, some of her alleged facts are accompanied by references to statutes or other legal authorities, and others have no references at all. In one instance, Harrelson's quotation of the trial court differs from the transcript, which she alleges is incorrect.[3] Harrelson's failure to support all of her statements of fact with references to the legal file leaves the Court "searching for a needle in a haystack[.]" *See Phox v. Boes*, 702 S.W.3d 498, 504 (Mo. App. W.D. 2024) (quoting *Brown v. Brown*, 645 S.W.3d 75, 83 (Mo. App. W.D. 2022)).

Harrelson's brief contains multiple sections designated as argument, but these sections also fail to comply with Rule 84.04. Harrelson fails to state how each alleged error was preserved for review; the argument for all four of her points relied on contains only a single citation to the record; and her case citations are largely either incorrect or fail to support her arguments. This Court may not research in an attempt to find legal

[3] Harrelson claims to have an audio recording of the hearing, but it is not part of the record on appeal. While an appealing party is entitled to a full and accurate transcript of the proceedings below to allow for the appellate court's proper review, a transcript that is incomplete or inaccurate does not automatically warrant a reversal. *Jackson v. State*, 514 S.W.2d 532, 533 (Mo. banc 1974). Harrelson is entitled to relief only if she exercised due diligence to correct any deficiencies in the record *and* shows that she was prejudiced by the alleged inaccuracies in the transcript. *State v. Borden*, 605 S.W.2d 88, 92 (Mo. banc 1980); *State v. Middleton*, 995 S.W.2d 443, 466 (Mo. banc 1999). In this matter there is nothing in the record before this Court that shows the transcript was in any way inaccurate or incomplete.

support for Harrelson's points on appeal, as courts may not become advocates for litigants. *Waller v. Shippey*, 251 S.W.3d 403, 406 (Mo. App. W.D. 2008) ("[I]t is not our duty to supplement the deficient brief with our own research.").

The deficiencies in Harrelson's brief render this Court unable to reach the merits of the appeal and require dismissal pursuant to Rule 84.13(a). *See Lexow*, 643 S.W.3d at 505-06.



Gary D. Witt, Presiding Judge

All concur