

October 20, 2003

Charles R. Fulbruge III
Clerk

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FIFTH CIRCUIT**

No. 03-10263

(Summary Calendar)

DONALD HENSLEY; ET AL

Plaintiffs,

DONALD HENSLEY

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION

Defendant - Appellee

Appeal from the United States District Court
For the Northern District of Texas, Dallas
USDC No. 3:99-CV-2370-P

Before BARKSDALE, EMILIO M. GARZA, and DENNIS, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

* Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

Donald Hensley appeals the district court's grant of the defendant's motion for summary judgment on his discriminations claims under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 1981.

Arguments must be briefed to be preserved. *Yohey v. Collins*, 985 F.2d 222, 225 (5th Cir. 1993). Although we apply less stringent standards to parties proceeding *pro se* than to litigants, *pro se* parties must still brief the issues and reasonably comply with FED R. APP. P. 28. *Grant v. Cuellar*, 59 F.3d 523, 524 (5th Cir. 1995). When an appellant fails to identify any error in the district court's analysis, it is the same as if the appellant had not appealed that judgment. *Brinkman v. Dallas County Deputy Sheriff Abner*, 813 F.2d 744, 748 (5th Cir. 1987). FED R. APP. P. 28(a)(9)(A) requires the appellant state the reasons he deserves the requested relief with citations to authorities. *Yohey*, 985 F.2d at 225.

Hensley makes no arguments and cites no authorities. He fails to challenge the district court's reasons for granting summary judgment or cite specific factual or legal errors made by the lower court. Consequently, Hensly has failed to adequately brief the issues for appeal. *See* FED R. APP. P. 28(a)(9)(A); *Yohey*, 985 F.2d at 225.

This appeal is frivolous and without merit and is accordingly DISMISSED. 5TH CIR. R. 42.2.