

IN THE SUPREME COURT
STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

2025 ND 196

Papa Ibrahima Diop,

Plaintiff

v.

Sarah Rae Altepeter,

Defendant and Appellant

and

State of North Dakota,

Statutory Real Party in Interest

No. 20250209

Appeal from the District Court of Cass County, East Central Judicial District, the
Honorable Stephanie R. Hayden, Judge.

AFFIRMED.

Per Curiam.

Sarah Rae Altepeter, self-represented, Fargo, ND, defendant and appellant;
submitted on brief.

Diop v. Altepeter, et al.
No. 20250209

Per Curiam.

[¶1] Sarah Rae Altepeter appeals from an order denying her motion to amend parenting time provisions in a divorce judgment. On appeal, Altepeter argues the district court's order did not consider all the evidence presented and inaccurately reflected the parties' in-court responses to proposed judgment amendments.

[¶2] Under Rule 35.1(a)(8), N.D.R.App.P., this Court may summarily affirm a judgment if the appellant's brief does not comply with the minimum requirements of N.D.R.App.P. 28(b). In *State v. Noack*, 2007 ND 82, ¶ 9, 732 N.W.2d 389, this Court explained:

Of the requirements imposed by N.D.R.App.P. 28, three are absolutely imperative for our review. At a minimum, a brief must contain 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 the facts; and the appellant's legal argument, including the authorities on which the appellant relies. Without these essential elements included in the appellant's brief, we decline to address the alleged errors because the case is not properly before us.

[¶3] An appellant has the primary duty to bring to the Court's attention the proper applicable rules of law. *Noack*, 2007 ND 82, ¶ 8. This Court does not address inadequately briefed issues. *Hoff v. State*, 2024 ND 235, ¶ 16, 14 N.W.3d 892. "A party waives an issue by not providing supporting argument and, without supportive reasoning or citations to relevant authorities, an argument is without merit." *State v. Gomez*, 2025 ND 60, ¶ 18, 18 N.W.3d 829 (cleaned up). "Issues not briefed on appeal are waived." *Hoff*, ¶ 16.

[¶4] Altepeter's brief generally references the record via document index numbers, but the vast majority of her argument lacks adequate citations to the record. She provides no case law and only one statute in support of her

arguments. Due to these omissions, Altepeter's brief is inadequate for our review.

[¶5] Altepeter argues the district court's order inaccurately reflected the parties' responses on the record regarding proposed amendments to the divorce judgment; however, she failed to file transcripts of evidentiary hearings on appeal. "[An] appellant must file with this Court the transcript of any evidentiary hearing held in the matter." *Laducer v. Laducer*, 2023 ND 117, ¶ 2, 992 N.W.2d 520; N.D.R.App.P. 10(b)(1). With no transcript to review, there is nothing in the record allowing us to analyze this argument.

[¶6] We summarily affirm under N.D.R.App.P. 35.1(a)(7) and (8).

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