MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS
WESTERN DISTRICT

JAMES BAKER, Appellant,
v.
CITY OF MAYSVILLE, ET AL., Respondents.

DOCKET NUMBER WD88301

DATE: July 28, 2026

Appeal From:

Dekalb County Circuit Court
The Honorable Ryan W. Horsman, Judge

Appellate Judges:

Division Two: Janet Sutton, Presiding Judge, Lisa White Hardwick, Judge, and W. Douglas Thomson, Judge

---

Attorneys:

Brian Klopfenstein, Kearney, MO, for Appellant.

Paul Gordon, Overland Park, KS, for Respondents.
Steven Coronado, Kansas City, MO, for Respondents.

MISSOURI APPELLATE COURT OPINION SUMMARY

MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS
WESTERN DISTRICT

JAMES BAKER, Appellant,
v.
CITY OF MAYSVILLE, ET AL., Respondents.

WD88301 Dekalb County

Before Division Two Judges: Janet Sutton, Presiding Judge, Lisa White Hardwick, Judge, and W. Douglas Thomson, Judge

Baker worked as a police officer for the City of Maysville from approximately August 2022 through May 2023. In March 2023, the city council received multiple complaints about Baker's conduct as a police officer from community members. Baker was placed on a three-day suspension without pay in late March 2023. After an additional hearing with Baker and his counsel present, the city counsel elected to terminate Baker.

Baker filed a petition in the circuit court alleging five counts. Respondents filed a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim upon which relief could be granted. The circuit court dismissed the matter with prejudice. Baker appealed, and this Court issued an order striking Baker's initial brief because it did not comply with Rule 84.04's briefing requirements. Baker's amended brief is still noncompliant with Rule 84.04.

DISMISSED.

Division Two holds:

Baker's appendix is noncompliant with Rule 84.04(h) because it includes multiple documents and photographs that are not included in the record on appeal. Baker references the documents that are in the appendix, but not in the record on appeal, throughout his amended brief. Baker's inclusion of additional documents in the appendix is especially problematic because these documents were never presented to the circuit court. Baker's statement of facts is noncompliant with Rule 84.04(c) because he only sporadically includes citations, some of which are insufficient because they do not mention a specific document or page number. Additionally, Baker's fourth point on appeal violates Rule 84.04(d) because it is multifarious and, thus, preserves nothing for review. Last, Baker's argument section violates Rule 84.04(e) because it makes generalized references to supporting documents, instead of specific page references, and only sporadically cites the record on appeal.

Opinion by: Janet Sutton, Presiding Judge July 28, 2026

This summary is UNOFFICIAL and should not be quoted or cited.