

**Electronically Filed
Intermediate Court of Appeals
CAAP-25-0000420
23-OCT-2026
07:50 AM
Dkt. 84 SO**

NO. CAAP-25-0000420

IN THE INTERMEDIATE COURT OF APPEALS
OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

STATE OF HAWAII, Plaintiff-Appellee, v.
WILLIAM GILROY, Defendant-Appellant

APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE THIRD CIRCUIT
KONA DIVISION
(CASE NO. 3DTC-24-200012)

SUMMARY DISPOSITION ORDER

(By: Leonard, Presiding Judge, Hiraoka and Wadsworth, JJ.)

William **Gilroy** was found guilty of driving without a license and not having motor vehicle insurance. Representing himself, he appeals from the *Judgment and Notice of Entry of Judgment* entered by the District Court of the Third Circuit, Kona Division.¹ We affirm.

On November 18, 2024, Gilroy was issued a *Citation for Traffic Crime(s)* for Driving Motor Vehicle Without Valid Driver's License (Hawaii Revised Statutes (**HRS**) § 286-102) and No Motor Vehicle Insurance Policy (HRS § 431:10C-104). Trial was held on April 24 and May 23, 2025. Gilroy was found guilty. The Judgment was entered on May 23, 2025. This appeal followed.

Gilroy's opening brief doesn't comply with Hawaii Rules of Appellate Procedure (**HRAP**) Rule 28(b), but we do not automatically foreclose self-represented litigants from appellate review for not complying with court rules. Erum v. Llego, 147

¹

The Honorable David Harada-Stone presided.

Hawaii 368, 380-81, 465 P.3d 815, 827-28 (2020). We address what we discern to be Gilroy's arguments.

(1) Gilroy contends the statutes he violated apply only to persons engaged in commercial or regulated activities, not to private travelers like him. They apply to everyone. State v. French, 77 Hawaii 222, 230, 883 P.2d 644, 652 (App. 1994).

Gilroy argues the district court lacked standing to proceed against him. "Standing is concerned with whether the parties have the right to bring suit." Pele Def. Fund v. Puna Geothermal Venture, 77 Hawaii 64, 67, 881 P.2d 1210, 1213 (1994) (emphasis added).

Gilroy argues that requiring a driver's license and motor vehicle insurance violates his right to travel on public roads under the federal and Hawaii constitutions. They do not. French, 77 Hawaii at 232, 883 P.2d at 654.

Gilroy argues the district court prevented him from obtaining discovery. He does not cite to the record where the claimed error took place, as required by HRAP Rule 28(b)(4) and (7). We are not obligated to search the record for information that should have been provided by Gilroy. Hawaii Ventures, LLC v. Otaka, Inc., 114 Hawaii 438, 480, 164 P.3d 696, 738 (2007). We decline to address his argument.

Gilroy argues the district court made several trial errors, but hasn't ordered trial transcripts for the record on appeal. "The burden is upon appellant in an appeal to show error by reference to matters in the record, and he or she has the responsibility of providing an adequate transcript." Bettencourt v. Bettencourt, 80 Hawaii 225, 230, 909 P.2d 553, 558 (1995) (brackets omitted). We decline to address his argument.

(2) Gilroy argues that criminalizing "private, non-commercial movement on public roadways absent harm or contractual duty exceeds the statute's authority and infringes" his fundamental right to travel. The authority he cites acknowledges the right to travel between states, but Gilroy wasn't traveling interstate. The authority he cites does not support the proposition that requiring a driver's license and motor vehicle

insurance unduly burdens his right to intrastate travel. It does not. French, 77 Hawai'i at 231-32, 883 P.2d at 653-54.

Gilroy argues his due process rights were violated by: proceeding without a plea or lawful arraignment; ignoring jurisdictional and standing objections raised on the record; preventing him from questioning witnesses or the court; refusing to accept and review a key witness affidavit; and shifting the burden of proof to him, presuming guilt. He provides no citations to the record or transcripts of proceedings. We decline to address his arguments. HRAP Rule 28(b)(4) and (7).

(3) Gilroy argues the fine, fees, and driver's license suspension imposed by the district court were improper because the court lacked jurisdiction to impose them, and he never had a driver's license to suspend. The district court has jurisdiction over violations of HRS § 286-102. See HRS § 286-136 (Supp. 2024) & 604-8(a) (2016). The district court also has jurisdiction over violations of HRS § 431:10C-104. See HRS §§ 431:10C-117(a) (Supp. 2024) & 604-8(a). The district court's suspension of a driver's license Gilroy claims to have never had would be harmless error.

The May 23, 2025 Judgment and Notice of Entry of Judgment is affirmed. Gilroy's motion for retention of oral argument is denied.

DATED: Honolulu, Hawai'i, October 23, 2026.

On the briefs:

William Gilroy,
Self-represented
Defendant-Appellant.

Kelden B.A. Waltjen,
Charles E. Murray III,
Office of the
Prosecuting Attorney,
for State of Hawai'i.

/s/ Katherine G. Leonard
Presiding Judge

/s/ Keith K. Hiraoka
Associate Judge

/s/ Clyde J. Wadsworth
Associate Judge