

FILED

August 22, 2003

Charles R. Fulbruge III
Clerk

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

03-60266
Summary Calendar

STEVEN E. JACOBSON, PhD;
JESUSA JACOBSON,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

ELIZABETH CLAY, Member of Aberdeen
School District School Board; LEON HENLEY,
Member of Aberdeen School District School Board;
MICHAEL JACKSON, Member of Aberdeen School
District School Board; JOHN E. NICKERSON,
Member of Aberdeen School District School Board;
SUSAN S. SANDERS, Member of Aberdeen School
District School Board; LAVON FLUKER-REED,
Superintendent of Aberdeen School District,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the
Northern District of Mississippi
(01-CV-433)

Before JONES, BENAVIDES, and CLEMENT, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM: *

Appellants appeal from the dismissal of myriad discrimination claims. We find no merit in Appellants' claims. Appellants assert a plethora of conclusional statements claiming shortcomings on the part of the district court and misdeeds by the appellees. The conclusory assertions are neither supported by the evidence nor by any argument. Because the briefs are inadequate, do not cite authority and consist of conclusory assertions, appellants have presented nothing for review. *See Nichols v. Scott*, 69 F.3d 1255, 1287 n.67 (5th Cir.1995); *See Fed.R.App.P. 28(a)(4)*. Even *pro se* appellants have a duty to abide by the briefing rules so as to inform the appellate court of the particular claims raised. *See Yohey v. Collins*, 985 F.2d 222, 224-25 (5th Cir.1993) (even parties proceeding *pro se* must brief an issue in order to preserve it for appeal). Here, Appellants fall woefully short.

In any event, out of an abundance of caution we have reviewed the record, including the pleadings and the summary judgment evidence and find no error. The judgment is in all things affirmed and the motion for sanctions denied and all other relief requested by Appellants is denied.

AFFIRMED. DENIED.

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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