Pursuant to Ind.Appellate Rule 65(D), this Memorandum Decision shall not be regarded as precedent or cited before any court except for the purpose of establishing the defense of res judicata, collateral estoppel, or the law of the case.

FILED
Mar 23 2011, 8:49 am
CLERK
of the supreme court, court of appeals and tax court

APPELLANT *PRO SE*:

AARON ISRAEL
Carlisle, Indiana

ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLEE:

GREGORY F. ZOELLER
Attorney General of Indiana

STEPHANIE L. ROTHENBERG
Deputy Attorney General
Indianapolis, Indiana

IN THE
COURT OF APPEALS OF INDIANA

AARON ISRAEL and GARY ROBERTSON,	)	
	)	
Appellants-Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	No. 46A03-1008-PL-445
	)	
J. DAVID DONAHUE, et al.,	)	
	)	
Appellees-Defendants.	)	

APPEAL FROM THE LaPORTE SUPERIOR COURT
The Honorable Jennifer L. Koethe, Judge
Cause No. 46D03-0606-PL-178

March 23, 2011

MEMORANDUM DECISION - NOT FOR PUBLICATION

BRADFORD, Judge

In this pro se appeal, Appellant-Plaintiff Aaron Israel challenges the trial court's judgment against him. We affirm.

On June 7, 2006, Israel filed a Verified Petition for Judicial Review of Administrative Decision Violative of United State[s] and Indiana Constitution[s] and Indiana Code/Policy and/or a Petition for Writ of Mandate to Either Enjoin Non-Compliance or Order Compliance with the Law. Appellant's App. p. 3. The trial court dismissed the petition that day on the grounds that it lacked jurisdiction. This court, concluding that the trial court had jurisdiction, reversed the dismissal and remanded the matter to the trial court. *See Israel v. J. David Donahue*, No. 46A03-0607-CV-335 (Ind. Ct. App. Oct. 13, 2006). On August 4, 2010, the trial court denied Israel's petition on the grounds that his claims were moot and failed to establish the violation of "any state or federal statutes or provisions of the state or federal constitutions." This appeal follows.

Our review of Israel's appeal is fatally impeded by his failure to conform to the Indiana Appellate Rules. Pursuant to Indiana Appellate Rule 50(A)(2)(f), an Appellant's Appendix shall contain a copy of the pleadings necessary for the resolution of issues on appeal. Pursuant to Indiana Appellate Rule 46(A)(8)(a), an appellant must use cogent reasoning supported by citations to the appendix or parts of the record relied upon. Here, Israel fails to include his complaint in his Appellant's Appendix. Without the complaint and proper references thereto in his forty-page, single-spaced challenge to its denial, we are unable to decipher, nor will we speculate upon, the basis for his appeal.

The judgment of the trial court is affirmed.

KIRSCH, J., and CRONE, J., concur.