

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE OF WASHINGTON,)
)
 Respondent,)
)
 v.)
)
 AVRUM TSIMERMAN,)
)
 Appellant.)
 _____)

DIVISION ONE

No. 70760-4-I

UNPUBLISHED OPINION

FILED: JUL 13 2015

FILED
COURT OF APPEALS DIV I
STATE OF WASHINGTON
2015 JUL 13 AM 9:08

PER CURIAM – Avrum Tsimerman appeals the restitution order entered following his convictions for four counts of first degree theft. Appearing pro se, he asks this court “to dismiss the restitution and to reverse the ruling for 4 counts of first degree theft.” But the conclusory, unsupported, and largely incoherent arguments in his brief advance no legally cognizable claims.¹ In addition, we note that Tsimerman separately appealed, and we recently affirmed, his underlying convictions.² He offers no basis to challenge those convictions again in this separate appeal from the order of restitution.

Affirmed.

FOR THE COURT:

Speziman, J.
Trickey, J.
Unky

¹ We need not consider arguments that are unsupported by meaningful analysis or authority. Cowiche Canyon Conservancy v. Bosley, 118 Wn.2d 801, 809, 828 P.2d 549 (1992) (arguments must be supported by authority); State v. Elliott, 114 Wn.2d 6, 15, 785 P.2d 440 (1990) (court need not consider claims that are insufficiently argued); State v. Marintorres, 93 Wn. App. 442, 452, 969 P.2d 501 (1999) (noting that pro se appellants are held to the same standard as attorneys and refusing to consider pro se’s conclusory and unsupported claims).

² State v. Tsimerman, No. 70569-5-I (Wash. Ct. App. March 16, 2015).