

the correctness of the decision of the Trial Court. *In re Estate of Wisly*, 5 T.T.R. 81.

Although it is not required to do so, this Court has closely scrutinized the record of this case and has found nothing which would justify disturbing the decision of the Trial Court.

The judgment of the Trial Division of the High Court in Palau District Civil Action No. 401 is affirmed.

---

**KALISTO BWANUS, Appellant**

v.

**KIOSI METSIFISTA and MARGARITA, Appellees**

Civil Appeal No. 65

Appellate Division of the High Court

August 8, 1975

Appeal from Trial Division judgment. The Appellate Division of the High Court, per curiam, affirmed after finding nothing in the record which could be used as a basis for disturbing the decision.

**1. Appeal and Error—Generally**

Appellant had burden of enumerating alleged errors, specifically showing wherein the action complained of was erroneous, and showing that the errors substantially prejudiced his rights.

**2. Appeal and Error—Standards and Tests**

Appellate courts are required to make every inference in favor of the correctness of a trial court decision.

Before **BURNETT**, *Chief Justice*, Hefner, *Associate Justice* and **WILLIAMS**, *Associate Justice*

**PER CURIAM**

This appeal from the Trial Division of the High Court was considered on the basis of appellant's notice of appeal, which contains no specific allegations of error. No written arguments having been submitted, and the Court having notified the parties herein, the Court proceeded to decide

the appeal in this matter pursuant to Rule 32(i) of the Rules of Criminal Procedure, which is also applicable to civil matters.

[1,2] The burden is upon the appellant to enumerate alleged errors, show specifically wherein the action complained of is erroneous, and show that such errors substantially prejudiced the rights of the appellant. Appellate Courts are required to make every inference in favor of the correctness of the decision of the Trial Court. *In re Estate of Wisly*, 5 T.T.R. 81.

Although it is not required to do so, this Court has closely scrutinized the record of this case and has found nothing which would justify disturbing the decision of the Trial Court.

The judgment of the Trial Division of the High Court in Palau District Civil Action No. 399 is affirmed.

---

**TECHERENG BAULES for ONGEROOL CLAN,  
Plaintiff-Appellant**

v.

**JOHN O. NGIRAKED, Palau District Land Management Officer,  
and DELBIRT RULUKED, Defendants-Appellees**

Civil Appeal No. 114

Appellate Division of the High Court

Palau District

August 8, 1975

---

*Counsel for Plaintiff-Appellant:* ROMAN TMETUHL  
*Counsel for Defendants-Appellees:* KALEB UDUI

HEFNER, *Associate Justice*

It appears that the certification of record was served on