MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS
WESTERN DISTRICT

SOUSAN LOGHMANI AND GOLNAZ IMAN, Respondents,
v.
NADER AFZALI, Appellant.

DOCKET NUMBER WD88179

DATE: November 17, 2026

Appeal From:

Jackson County Circuit Court
The Honorable Jessica Agnelly, Judge

Appellate Judges:

Division One: Alok Ahuja, Presiding Judge, Thomas N. Chapman, Judge, and Janet Sutton, Judge

---

Attorneys:

Nader Afzali, Overland Park, KS, appellant acting pro se.

Rick Frawley, Kansas City, MO, for respondents.
Matthew Lytle, Kansas City, MO, for respondents.

MISSOURI APPELLATE COURT OPINION SUMMARY

MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS
WESTERN DISTRICT

SOUSAN LOGHMANI AND GOLNAZ IMAN, Respondents,
v.
NADER AFZALI, Appellant.

WD88179 Jackson County

Before Division One: Alok Ahuja, Presiding Judge, Thomas N. Chapman, Judge, and Janet Sutton, Judge

Nader Afzali ("Afzali") appeals pro se from a judgment of the Circuit Court of Jackson County following a bench trial at which Afzali failed to appear. The trial court's judgment found in favor of Plaintiffs Sousan Loghmani ("Loghmani") and Golnaz Iman ("Iman" and, together with Loghmani, "Plaintiffs") on one count of fraud, one count of abuse of process, and one count of injurious falsehood. Afzali raises seven points on appeal, arguing that the trial court erred (1) by exercising personal jurisdiction over him, (2) by entering judgment while motions remained unresolved, (3) by denying dismissal under the doctrine of forum non conveniens, (4) by admitting evidence, (5) in the damages awarded, (6) by entering judgment on a record tainted by fraud, and (7) by entering judgment based on the inaccurate premise that he had not objected to jurisdiction.

AFFIRMED.

Division One holds:

1. Pursuant to Rule 55.27, Afzali waived the defenses of lack of jurisdiction over the person and insufficiency of service of process when he filed a pre-answer motion to dismiss asserting numerous defenses but not asserting the defenses of lack of jurisdiction over the person or insufficiency of service of process.

2. Afzali failed to make a sufficient legal argument in support of his second point on appeal regarding the timing of the issuance of the trial court's judgment by failing to explain why the law supported his assertion of reversible error and by failing to support his argument with relevant legal authority or to explain the absence of such authority.

3. Afzali failed to establish error regarding the trial court's denial of his motion to dismiss on grounds of forum non conveniens where he failed to acknowledge or address

the relevant factors weighing on the determination, where he failed to address the trial court's finding that he committed a tort in the county where trial was held, and where he failed to make a clear argument supported by citations to the record.

4. Afzali failed to preserve any claims of error regarding the admission of evidence where he raised no objections at trial and where his point on appeal was multifarious by raising multiple distinct allegations of error.

5. Afzali failed to preserve any claims of error regarding the damages awarded where his point relied on was multifarious by challenging numerous distinct trial court actions on distinct theories and where he failed to present clear and developed arguments supported by relevant authority and legal standards.

6. Afzali failed to preserve any allegations of error regarding the trial court's reliance on the evidence admitted at trial where he failed to object at trial.

7. The trial court did not err in understanding that Afzali had not objected to personal jurisdiction where Afzali had waived the defense of lack of jurisdiction over the person.

Opinion by: Thomas N. Chapman, Judge November 17, 2026

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