

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

February 23, 2012

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

---

No. 11-40839  
Summary Calendar

---

LOUIS CHARLES HAMILTON, II,

Plaintiff-Appellant

v.

WILLIE M. ZANDERS, Attorney at Law; WALTER A. DENNIS; ROSEMARY DENNIS,

Defendants-Appellees

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of Texas  
USDC No. 1:11-CV-5

---

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, DAVIS, and ELROD, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

The district court dismissed this action *sua sponte* as malicious. Because Mr. Hamilton has failed to present a nonfrivolous issue regarding the district court's dismissal, we DISMISS his appeal as frivolous.<sup>1</sup> Alternatively, we

---

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

<sup>1</sup> See 5TH CIR. R. 42.2.

No. 11-40839

DISMISS the appeal because of the complete noncompliance of Mr. Hamilton's brief with Rule 28 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> See *Grant v. Cuellar*, 59 F.3d 523, 524 (5th Cir. 1995) (per curiam) (“Although we liberally construe briefs of *pro se* litigants and apply less stringent standards to parties proceeding *pro se* than to parties represented by counsel, *pro se* parties must still brief the issues and reasonably comply with the standards of Rule 28.” (footnote omitted)).