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
Jun 09 2011, 8:54 am
CLERK
of the supreme court, court of appeals and tax court

APPELLANT PRO SE:

J.D.
Calumet City, Illinois

ATTORNEY FOR APPELLEE:

BURTON A. PADOVE
Padove Law
Highland, Indiana

IN THE
COURT OF APPEALS OF INDIANA

IN THE MATTER OF THE PATERNITY OF J.T.L., Minor Child,	)	
J.D., Father,	)	
Appellant-Petitioner,	)	
vs.	)	No. 45A04-1004-JP-287
L.L., Mother,	)	
Appellee-Respondent,	)	

APPEAL FROM THE LAKE SUPERIOR COURT
The Honorable John M. Sedia, Magistrate
Cause No. 45D06-0106-JP-429

June 9, 2011

MEMORANDUM DECISION - NOT FOR PUBLICATION

MAY, Judge

J.D. (Father) appeals the trial court's decision to deny his motion to vacate, motion for change in magistrate, and motion for contempt and sanctions against the attorney who represented L.L. (Mother). We affirm.

FACTS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

In 2005, the trial court ordered Father to pay Mother $46,178.60 in child support arrearages. In 2007, Father attempted to appeal the denial of his motion to correct error, and we dismissed that appeal. *See In the Matter of J.T.L.*, No. 45A03-0712-JV-572 (Ind. Ct. App., March 12, 2008), *reh'g denied*, *trans. denied*. On January 20, 2009, Father moved to vacate the 2005 order. On March 24, 2010, the trial court held a hearing to address all pending issues, including Father's requests for change of magistrate, an order of contempt and sanctions against Mother's attorney, and motion to vacate the 2005 decision. The trial court denied Father's motions and set a support hearing for May 12.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION

We give substantial deference to the trial court's decision to grant or deny a motion for relief from judgment, and reverse only for abuse of discretion. *Rissler v. Lynch*, 744 N.E.2d 1030, 1032 (Ind. Ct. App. 2001). An abuse of discretion occurs if the trial court's decision is clearly against the logic and effect of the facts and circumstances before the court, or if the court has misinterpreted the law. *Id*. In reviewing the decision of the trial court, we will not reweigh the evidence or substitute our judgment for that of the trial court. *Id*.

Although Father proceeds *pro se*, and is expected to follow the same procedural rules as a licensed attorney. *See Goossens v. Goossens*, 829 N.E.2d 36, 43 (Ind. Ct. App. 2005).

Ind. Appellate Rule 46(A)(8) requires Father to set forth in his brief "contentions why the trial court . . . committed reversible error" and to support those contentions with "cogent reasoning . . . supported by citations to the authorities, statutes, and the Appendix or parts of the Record on Appeal relied on[.]" Failure to present an argument supported by cogent reasoning can result in a waiver of the issue. *Srivastava v. Indianapolis Hebrew Congregation, Inc.*, 779 N.E.2d 52, 55 fn.1 (Ind. Ct. App. 2002).

Father's brief centers around alleged deficiencies in the 2005 child support order. He makes no argument demonstrating the trial court abused its discretion on March 24, 2010, by denying his motion to vacate the 2005 child support order, his motion for change of magistrate, or his motion for a finding of contempt and sanctions against Mother's attorney.

Because he has not presented cogent argument regarding the decisions of the trial court he purports to now appeal, Father waived those issues. We accordingly affirm the decision of the trial court.

Affirmed.

BAKER, J., and BRADFORD, J., concur.