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
Dec 22 2009, 10:48 am
CLERK
of the supreme court, court of appeals and tax court

APPELLANT PRO SE:

JAY H. WRIGHT
Danville, Indiana

ATTORNEY FOR APPELLEE:

GLENN S. VICIAN
Bowman, Heintz, Boscia & Vician, P.C.
Merrillville, Indiana

IN THE
COURT OF APPEALS OF INDIANA

JAY H. WRIGHT,	)	
	)	
Appellant-Defendant,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	No. 32A01-0902-CV-71
	)	
HSBC BANK NEVADA, N.A.,	)	
	)	
Appellee-Plaintiff.	)	
	)	
	)	

APPEAL FROM THE HENDRICKS CIRCUIT COURT
The Honorable Jeffrey V. Boles, Judge
Cause No. 32C01-0801-CC-42

December 22, 2009

MEMORANDUM DECISION - NOT FOR PUBLICATION

CRONE, Judge

Case Summary

Jay Wright, pro se, appeals the trial court's judgment in favor of HSBC Bank, Nevada, N.A. ("HSBC"). We affirm.

Facts and Procedural History

On January 24, 2008, HSBC filed a complaint against Wright for nonpayment of credit card debt in the amount of $2456.10 plus attorney fees and costs. Wright appeared pro se at the bench trial held on January 27, 2009. Prior to the commencement of the trial, Wright made a motion to recuse, which the trial court denied. Wright then exited the courtroom, advising the court he was leaving and "going to go to the Supreme Court" because his motion to recuse was denied. Tr. at 42. Thereafter, the court heard evidence and entered judgment in favor of HSBC.

Discussion and Decision

We note that Wright chose to proceed pro se both at the trial and appellate level. Wright not only made a poor decision of walking out during his bench trial, but he has also submitted an appellate brief that is totally devoid of cogent argument. He cites no cases as authority for any proposition, and his arguments are too poorly developed and confusing to be considered cogent for the purposes of appellate review. It is well settled that litigants who proceed pro se are held to the same standard as trained counsel and are required to follow procedural rules. *Sumbry v. Boklund*, 836 N.E.2d 430, 432 (Ind. 2005); *Rickels v. Herr*, 638 N.E.2d 1280, 1283 (Ind. Ct. App. 1994). Wright's failure to provide us with cogent

argument has resulted in the waiver of the issues he purports to raise on appeal.[1] *See* Ind. Appellate Rule 46(A)(8)(a) (requiring that contentions in appellant's brief be supported by cogent reasoning and citations to authorities, statutes, and the appendix or parts of the record on appeal). Therefore, we affirm the trial court's judgment.

Affirmed.

RILEY, J., and VAIDIK, J., concur.

[1] Notwithstanding his lack of cogent argument, we note that because Wright walked out of the bench trial, he raised none of his purported issues before the trial court and, therefore, has waived our review of those issues. *Terry v. Ind. State Univ.*, 666 N.E.2d 87, 90 (Ind. Ct. App. 1996).