

**MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS
WESTERN DISTRICT**

COMPLETE TITLE OF CASE:

BONITA ANN BUCKLEY

Respondent

v.

CHARLES JAMES GARY TIPTON

Appellant

DOCKET NUMBER **WD68856**

DATE: December 9, 2008

Appeal From:

Circuit Court of Livingston County, MO
The Honorable Stephen K. Griffin, Judge

Appellate Judges:

Division Four: Thomas H. Newton, C.J., James M. Smart, Jr., and James Edward Welsh, JJ.

Attorneys:

Charles James Gary Tipton, Grants Pass,OR

Appellant Acting Pro Se

Attorneys:

Michael R. Leamer, Chillicothe, MO

Counsel for Respondent

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

BONITA ANN BUCKLEY, Respondent, v.
CHARLES JAMES GARY TIPTON, Appellant

WD68856

Livingston County

Before Division Four Judges: Thomas H. Newton, C.J., James M. Smart, Jr., and James Edward Welsh, JJ.

Mr. Charles James Gary Tipton appeals the trial court's judgment modifying a dissolution decree in favor of his former wife Ms. Bonita Ann Buckley and finding him in contempt of court. Ms. Buckley sought modification of the decree to exclude their minor children's overnight stays with Mr. Tipton and to prohibit visits at his Missouri home. Ms. Buckley also filed a motion for contempt based on Mr. Tipton's failure to pay child support and his share of the children's medical expenses. Mr. Tipton filed countermotions to modify the decree and for contempt, alleging *inter alia* that Ms. Buckley denied him access to the children. After a hearing, the trial court found that their oldest child was emancipated, modified Mr. Tipton's child support obligations, adopted Ms. Buckley's parenting plan, and found Mr. Tipton in contempt for non-payment of medical bills and child support. Mr. Tipton appeals *pro se*.

DISMISSED.

Division Four holds:

Rule 84.04 sets forth the requirements for briefing an appeal. The purpose of this rule is to clarify the facts, issues, and arguments on appeal—for both the opposing party and the court. Adherence to the rule is required so that we do not unfairly advocate for a party or speculate on a party's arguments. Although we prefer to dispose of a case on the merits, if we cannot comprehend the essential facts, the points relied on, or the arguments, we have no alternative but to dismiss the appeal.

Mr. Tipton's appellate briefing does not inform us of the basis for the appeal and fails to comply with Rule 84.04. Accordingly, his appeal is dismissed.

Opinion by: Thomas H. Newton, C. J.

December 9, 2008

* * * * *

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