

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA

No. 15-0884
Filed June 29, 2016

HAJRUDIN PURIC a/k/a RUDY PURIC,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

vs.

**SAMIR DURATOVIC, COCO
TRANSPORTATION, LLC, and
C & A TRANSPORT, LLC,**
Defendants-Appellees.

**ARJANA ROSIC, and
C & A TRANSPORT, LLC,**
Counterclaim Plaintiffs,

vs.

HAJRUDIN PURIC,
Counterclaim Defendant.

Appeal from the Iowa District Court for Black Hawk County, David F. Staudt, Judge.

Plaintiff appeals the district court's denial of his conversion and contract claims and the district court's award of damages to defendants on their counterclaim. **AFFIRMED.**

Erin Patrick Lyons of Dutton, Braun, Staack & Hellman, P.L.C., Waterloo, for appellant.

Michael H. Bandy of Bandy Law Office, Waterloo, for appellees.

Considered by Vaitheswaran, P.J., and Doyle and Mullins, JJ.

MULLINS, Judge.

Hajrudin Puric sued Samir Duratovic, CCO Transportation, LLC, and C & A Transport, LLC, alleging several theories of recovery arising out of misunderstandings concerning certain loans, a motor vehicle title, and the transfer of that title. Arjana Rosic and C & A Transport, LLC sued Puric for moneys they claimed were owed for repairs to the motor vehicle.¹ After the cases were consolidated and heard by the district court, it issued a thorough written ruling. Puric has appealed, alleging the court erred in denying his conversion and breach-of-contract claims and in granting relief to defendants on what is referenced as a counterclaim.

Apart from a lease agreement, which provided terms pertaining to Puric's role as an independent contractor with defendants, the alleged contracts by and between the parties were all oral agreements. Puric signed the title assigning it to defendants. Although some documents exist with regard to damage claims, the agreements or misunderstandings concerning the agreements were mostly oral. The district court considered all the evidence and made numerous credibility findings that bore directly on determining what was agreed by the parties and what was not. It likewise made numerous credibility findings in reaching conclusions as to what agreements were breached and what were not.

On our review of the briefs, the record, and the district court's ruling and giving appropriate deference to that court's credibility findings, we agree with the

¹ For ease of reference, all parties other than Puric will be collectively identified as defendants.

factual findings of that court and determine based on those findings it made no errors at law and its ruling is supported by substantial evidence.

We affirm by memorandum opinion. Iowa Ct. R. 21.26(1)(b), (d).

AFFIRMED.