

2012 IL App (1st) 112682-U

FOURTH DIVISION
June 14, 2012

No. 1-11-2682

NOTICE: This order was filed under Supreme Court Rule 23 and may not be cited as precedent by any party except in the limited circumstances allowed under Rule 23(e)(1).

IN THE
APPELLATE COURT OF ILLINOIS
FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT

EDITH BEASLEY,)	Appeal from the
)	Circuit Court of
Plaintiff-Appellant,)	Cook County.
)	
v.)	No. 11 M1 40366
)	
COOK BROS., INC.,)	Honorable
)	Stanley L. Hill,
Defendant-Appellee.)	Judge Presiding.

JUSTICE FITZGERALD SMITH delivered the judgment of the court.
Presiding Justice Lavin and Justice Pucinski concurred in the judgment.

ORDER

- ¶ 1 *Held:* Judgment affirmed on presumption of correctness where plaintiff failed to provide a sufficiently complete record to support her claims of error, or comply with Supreme Court Rule 341 in presenting her arguments.
- ¶ 2 Plaintiff Edith Beasley, *pro se*, filed a complaint against defendant Cook Bros., Inc., alleging that the television set she purchased from the store was not the model she was led to believe she had purchased. The circuit court granted judgment in favor of defendant, and plaintiff now appeals from that order, claiming that defendant engaged in unfair or deceptive

advertising and that it breached the original contractual agreement. She also questions whether state law requires store policies to be posted in the entryway of the store.

¶ 3 We find, however, that we cannot reach the merits of these claims due to plaintiff's failure to conform with the supreme court rules governing appellate briefs. Ill. S. Ct. R. 341(h) (eff. Jul. 1, 2008); Ill. S. Ct. R. 342 (eff. Jan. 1, 2005). Plaintiff's *pro se* brief consists of an extended recitation of facts without reference to the record, argument based on law, or any alleged error on the part of the trial court. Plaintiff's *pro se* status does not excuse her from complying with supreme court rules governing appellate procedure (*Coleman v. Akpakpan*, 402 Ill. App. 3d 822, 825 (2010)), and she is expected to meet a minimum standard before this court can adequately review the decision of the circuit court (*Rock Island County v. Boalbey*, 242 Ill. App. 3d 461, 462 (1993)). Plaintiff has not done so here, and we are also without the benefit of a cogent brief from appellee, Cook Bros., Inc., which filed a one-page brief which does not contain an argument section.

¶ 4 In addition, plaintiff has failed to meet her burden to provide this court with a sufficient record for review of any possible error. *Foutch v. O'Bryant*, 99 Ill. 2d 389, 391-92 (1984). The record on appeal in this case consists of one, nine-page volume of common law documents, including two copies of plaintiff's complaint. The circuit court's order merely states "judgment F/defendant Cook Bros, Inc. and against Plaintiff Edith Beasley." The record does not contain any transcripts, or any substitute report of proceedings pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 323 (eff. Dec. 13, 2005). Consequently, this court has no knowledge of what evidence or arguments were presented to the trial court, what findings the court made, or the reasoning and rationale that provided the basis for the court's ruling. Under these circumstances, this court must presume that the circuit court acted in conformity with the law and ruled properly after considering the

1-11-2682

evidence before it. *Webster v. Hartman*, 195 Ill. 2d 426, 433-34 (2001); *Foutch*, 99 Ill. 2d at 391-92.

¶ 5 For these reasons, we affirm the judgment of the circuit court of Cook County.

¶ 6 Affirmed.