

**COURT OF APPEALS
DECISION
DATED AND FILED**

November 3, 2009

David R. Schanker
Clerk of Court of Appeals

NOTICE

This opinion is subject to further editing. If published, the official version will appear in the bound volume of the Official Reports.

A party may file with the Supreme Court a petition to review an adverse decision by the Court of Appeals. See WIS. STAT. § 808.10 and RULE 809.62.

Appeal No. 2008AP3108

Cir. Ct. No. 2004CV10117

STATE OF WISCONSIN

**IN COURT OF APPEALS
DISTRICT I**

NILIMA MEHRA,

PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT,

v.

**CONTINENTAL CASUALTY COMPANY, QUALE & ASSOCIATES, INC.,
D/B/A HANDYMAN CONNECTION AND TERRY L. NICHOLSON,**

DEFENDANTS-RESPONDENTS.

APPEAL from a judgment of the circuit court for Milwaukee County: MAXINE A. WHITE, Judge. *Affirmed.*

Before Curley, P.J., Fine and Kessler, JJ.

¶1 PER CURIAM. Nilima Mehra appeals from a judgment of dismissal entered after a jury found that Terry L. Nicholson did not install the light fixture that struck Mehra when it fell from her kitchen ceiling. Because Mehra makes no developed or coherent appellate argument, we affirm.

¶2 Mehra alleged that Nicholson had installed a ceiling fan and light fixture in Mehra's kitchen that later fell from the ceiling and struck Mehra in the head, causing her injury. Mehra sued Nicholson, his employer, Quale & Associates, d/b/a Handyman Connection, and their insurer, Continental Casualty Company. The case was tried to a jury. Mehra testified that Nicholson installed the light fixture that fell, while Nicholson testified that he repaired a light fixture in a hallway and installed two shop lights in Mehra's basement. Nicholson denied ever installing or repairing the light fixture that fell. The jury was asked specifically whether Nicholson had installed the light fixture that fell, and the jury answered, "no." The jury also awarded Mehra \$0 in damages for past pain, suffering, and disability, and \$0 for past loss of earning capacity.

¶3 In a motion after verdict, Mehra asked for a new trial because Nicholson lied and because one of the medical witnesses falsely testified that Mehra had carpal tunnel syndrome, thus providing a medical explanation for some of Mehra's medical issues that she attributed to being struck by the fixture. The trial court rejected Mehra's challenge to the credibility assessments made by the jury and concluded that sufficient evidence supported the verdict. Accordingly, the trial court denied Mehra's motion and a judgment of dismissal was entered.

¶4 In her appellate brief, Mehra spends twenty-seven pages detailing the trial testimony, evidentiary rulings, and argument that took place over the three-day jury trial. Throughout those twenty-seven pages, Mehra includes what can best be described as a running editorial commentary, pointing out the evidence she believes to be incredible and the trial court rulings she believes were incorrect. In no instance, however, does Mehra make any coherent legal argument. Her brief contains no citation to legal authority. The "Argument" section of her brief takes

up one-half page and consists of seven single-sentence “questions” that imply that the trial judge was biased against her and that the judge purposely misled the jury in order to protect Nicholson and his attorney. For relief, Mehra requests that Nicholson be “criminally charged for his N-A-S-T-Y Intentions to destroy her newly remodeled kitchen”; that Nicholson’s employer “be penalized for sending worthless workers to hurt citizens[’] homes”; that Nicholson’s lawyer be disbarred “for his sly, manipulative ways”; that the trial judge be “remove[d] from the bench”; and that she receive damages for lost wages, medical expenses, and pain, grief and suffering.

¶5 We are not required to consider undeveloped arguments, *Truttschel v. Martin*, 208 Wis. 2d 361, 369, 560 N.W.2d 315 (Ct. App. 1997), and we may decline to review issues which are inadequately briefed, *State v. Pettit*, 171 Wis. 2d 627, 646-47, 492 N.W.2d 633 (Ct. App. 1992). Arguments unsupported by reference to legal authority need not be considered. *Id.* at 647. Mehra’s brief contains undeveloped arguments, inadequately briefed issues, and arguments that are not supported by legal authority. Although Mehra is representing herself and, thus, is allowed some leniency, *see Waushara County v. Graf*, 166 Wis. 2d 442, 452, 480 N.W.2d 16 (1992), this court does not have a duty to develop her arguments, *see Pettit*, 171 Wis. 2d at 647 (Appellate judges cannot serve as both advocates and judges.).

¶6 We conclude that Mehra failed to adequately develop any legal arguments. For this court to consider her arguments, we would first have to develop them further for her and we cannot be both judges and advocates. *See id.* We therefore affirm the judgment of the circuit court.

By the Court.—Judgment affirmed.

This opinion will not be published. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE
809.23(1)(b)5. (2007-08).

