

Ruluked v. Delbirt, 14 ROP 183 (2007)
DIRRULANG RULUKED,
Appellant,

v.

AKEMI DELBIRT RULUKED,
Appellee.

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 07-011
Case No. LC/K 06-108

Supreme Court, Appellate Division
Republic of Palau

Decided: [date of decision not listed]

Counsel for Appellant: Pro Se

Counsel for Appellee: Pro Se

SALII, Justice:

Appellant Dirrulang Ruluked has filed a motion for a redetermination of transcript costs. Appellant filed her notice of appeal on March 29, 2007. Appellant's notice of appeal specifically stated that, "Appellant designates the entire Land Claims Hearing Office file for the above noted Case number (including the transcript of any hearings which were held) of the above described land as the record to be submitted to this Court for consideration on appeal But Appellant does not want the testimony for the land Isebong and described as Tochi Daicho Lot Nos 840/Worksheet Lot No. 05 K 002-015 which was heard at the same time but issued to others in Determination of Ownership No. 09-258."

Pursuant to Rule 10(b) of the ROP Rules of Appellate Procedure, an appellant must request in writing the testimony and evidence she wishes to be transcribed. An appellant must specifically identify which testimony and evidence she wants. If appellant wants only to include the testimony of a few individuals, it is the responsibility of appellant to specifically list the names of the individuals whose testimony she wants included. Appellant's original designation, stating only that she did not "want the testimony for the land Isebong," failed to adequately identify which portions of the testimony and evidence she wanted transcribed.

Appellant's motion for a redetermination of transcript costs states that she wishes only that the testimony of Ngirabelau Sambal and Akemi Delbirt's testimony be transcribed. This request is adequately specific and it is hereby ordered a new estimated transcript cost be calculated and provided to Appellant along with the expected dates of payment.