

**IN THE MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS
WESTERN DISTRICT**

COMPLETE TITLE OF CASE

ELIZABETH SANDERS,

Appellant,

v.

DIVISION OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY,

Respondent.

DOCKET NUMBER WD75256

**MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS
WESTERN DISTRICT**

DATE: March 5, 2013

APPEAL FROM

The Labor and Industrial Relations Commission

JUDGES

Division Two: Mitchell, P.J., and Newton and Hardwick, JJ.

CONCURRING.

ATTORNEYS

Elizabeth Sanders
Kansas City, MO

Appellant, *pro se*,

Bart A. Matanic
Jefferson City, MO

Attorney for Respondent.



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

ELIZABETH SANDERS,)
)
) **Appellant,**)
)
 v.)
)
 DIVISION OF EMPLOYMENT)
 SECURITY,)
)
) **Respondent.**)

OPINION FILED:
March 5, 2013

WD75256

Labor and Industrial Relations Commission

Before Division Two Judges: Karen King Mitchell, Presiding Judge, and Thomas H. Newton and Lisa White Hardwick, Judges

Elizabeth Sanders appeals a decision of the Labor and Industrial Relations Commission, dismissing, as untimely, her application for review of the Missouri Division of Employment Security’s decision that Sanders’s appeal of the denial of her claim for unemployment benefits was untimely.

APPEAL DISMISSED.

Division Two holds:

Sanders’s only claim on appeal is that the Division’s appeals tribunal erred in dismissing her administrative appeal as untimely. But because Sanders’s application for review to the Commission was also untimely, the Commission never reviewed the merits of her claim regarding error by the appeals tribunal. Rather, the Commission dismissed Sanders’s application for review as untimely. On appeal, we review the decision of the Commission, not the appeals tribunal. Because Sanders fails to challenge the basis for the Commission’s dismissal, she has failed to present us with any appealable issues. Additionally, her brief, in violation of Rule 84.04, fails to identify any legal authority or citations to the record to support her claim of error. Due to the multiple deficiencies, this appeal is dismissed.

Opinion by: Karen King Mitchell, Presiding Judge

March 5, 2013

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