

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
SECOND DISTRICT

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE)	Appeal from the Circuit Court
OF ILLINOIS,)	of Winnebago County.
)	
Plaintiff-Appellee,)	
)	
v.)	No. 07-CF-2473
)	
DONALD PARSONS,)	Honorable
)	Joseph G. McGraw,
Defendant-Appellant.)	Judge, Presiding.

JUSTICE BOWMAN delivered the judgment of the court.
Justices Burke and Schostok concurred in the judgment.

ORDER

Held: Plaintiff waived his suppression issue by pleading guilty; although he argued that his guilty plea was invalid, he forfeited that contention by failing to present cogent argument supported by authority.

¶ 1 Defendant, Donald Parsons, was charged with two counts of aggravated driving under the influence of alcohol (625 ILCS 5/11-501(d)(1)(F) (West 2006)) and one count of aggravated driving while his license was revoked (625 ILCS 5/6-303(d-4) (West 2006)). Defendant moved for the suppression of evidence obtained by police while defendant was being treated in a hospital emergency room, but the trial court denied the motion. Defendant then entered a negotiated guilty

plea to one count of aggravated driving under the influence and the count of aggravated driving while his license was revoked, and the trial court sentenced defendant to 10 years' imprisonment on the former and 5 years' imprisonment on the latter, with the sentences to run concurrently. Following an unsuccessful motion to withdraw his plea and reconsider his sentence, defendant filed this timely appeal.

¶2 On appeal, defendant contends that (1) the trial court erred in denying his motion to suppress, because he had a reasonable expectation of privacy in the hospital emergency room, and (2) the trial court erred in denying his motion to withdraw his plea. For the reasons that follow, we affirm.

¶3 Defendant's first contention—that the trial court erred in denying his motion to suppress—is waived due to defendant's entry of a guilty plea. “A defendant who wishes to appeal the denial of a motion to suppress makes a mistake in pleading guilty. A voluntary guilty plea waives all nonjurisdictional errors or defects.” *People v. Cunningham*, 286 Ill. App. 3d 346, 348 (1997). Because, as we will discuss below, defendant has failed to establish that his guilty plea was involuntary, he has waived review of any nonjurisdictional defects by pleading guilty.

¶4 Defendant has forfeited his contention that the trial court erred in denying his motion to withdraw his plea, by failing to cite applicable authority and failing to provide argument in support of his contention. Illinois Supreme Court Rule 341(h)(7) (eff. July 1, 2008) requires that the appellant's brief include “[a]rgument, which shall contain the contentions of the appellant and the reasons therefor, with citation of the authorities and the pages of the record relied on.” Thus, when submitting briefs to this court, appellants must clearly define the issues raised and cite relevant authority, as this court is not a repository into which appellants may dump the burden of research. *Obert v. Saville*, 253 Ill. App. 3d 677, 682 (1993).

¶ 5 Defendant's argument on this issue consists of three vague and conclusory sentences that are unsupported by any references to the record or caselaw. Two of the sentences relate to the fairness of the sentencing hearing. Defendant contends that he was confused and ill-prepared at the sentencing hearing and that his attorney failed to call mitigating witnesses. Defendant does not explain how any errors that may have occurred at the sentencing hearing would have affected the voluntariness of his guilty plea. Even if defendant is seeking sentencing relief on appeal (which is not clear from his brief), he fails to explain how his confusion and lack of preparation constituted error in the sentencing or how his counsel's failure to call the mitigating witnesses prejudiced him. Defendant does not even identify the missing witnesses or describe what their testimony would have consisted of.

¶ 6 The third sentence of defendant's argument consists of allegations that his counsel was ineffective in representing him during the plea proceedings and that he was coerced into a guilty plea that he did not understand. Defendant does not, however, identify the respects in which his attorney was ineffective, nor does defendant discuss the alleged coercion he experienced, what aspects of the guilty plea he did not comprehend, or what prevented his comprehension of the proceedings. Because defendant has completely failed to develop his contention that the trial court erred in denying his motion to withdraw and has failed to cite any supportive authority, he has forfeited his contention that the trial court erred in denying his motion. See *People v. Agnew-Downs*, 404 Ill. App. 3d 218, 231 (2010) (failure to develop the argument and support it with legal authority results in forfeiture under Rule 341(h)(7)).

¶ 7 For the reasons stated, we affirm the judgment of the circuit court of Winnebago County.

¶ 8 Affirmed.