

IN THE SUPREME COURT
STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

2025 ND 150

State of North Dakota,

Plaintiff

v.

Jose Francesco Vasquez,

Defendant and Appellant

No. 20250196

Appeal from the District Court of McLean County, South Central Judicial District, the Honorable David E. Reich, Judge.

AFFIRMED.

Per Curiam.

Jose Francesco Vasquez, self-represented, Hazen, ND, defendant and appellant; on brief.

State v. Vasquez
No. 20250196

Per Curiam.

[¶1] Jose Vasquez appeals from a district court judgment convicting him of preventing arrest or discharge of other duties, driving while license is suspended, and failure to transfer title. On appeal, Vasquez argues the court lacked jurisdiction, the court’s reliance on Department of Transportation suspension notices sent to an undeliverable address violated due process, enforcement of vehicle registration requirements “appear[ed] predicated on an ambiguous interpretation that no clearly codified requirement for non-resident vehicle registration exists,” officers practiced selective enforcement by charging a non-resident under an ambiguous statute and mischaracterizing his actions as preventing arrest, and the court erred in finding him guilty of preventing arrest.

[¶2] Vasquez’s legal arguments are sparse, largely unsupported, and fail to include citations to the record showing the issues on appeal were raised in the district court. Under N.D.R.App.P. 28(b), imperative requirements of an appellant’s brief include: a statement of the issues presented for review; a statement of the facts, and, where those facts are disputed, references to the evidentiary record supporting the appellant’s statement of facts; and appellant’s legal argument, including the authorities appellant relies upon. *State v. Noack*, 2007 ND 82, ¶ 9, 732 N.W.2d 389. Vasquez’s brief omits numerous components required under N.D.R.App.P. 28(b), including table of contents, table of authorities, grounds for appellate jurisdiction, record citations, authorities supporting his jurisdictional argument, and standards of review.

[¶3] As Vasquez’s brief does not meet the minimum requirements of N.D.R.App.P. 28(b), and his arguments are not adequately supported, we summarily affirm the district court’s judgment under N.D.R.App.P. 35.1(a)(8).

[14] Jon J. Jensen, C.J.
Daniel J. Crothers
Lisa Fair McEvers
Jerod E. Tufte
Douglas A. Bahr