

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

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

August 15, 2012

---

No. 12-50121  
Summary Calendar

---

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

EDWARD DESHAN SMITH,

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

GIDDINGS, TEXAS; LEE COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT; DEREK  
EASLEY, Sheriff's Deputy; SHERIFF DEPUTY CARVIN; SHERIFF  
DEPUTY ROBERTSON; MARIEL DAWSON,

Defendants - Appellees

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Texas  
U.S. Dist. Ct. No. 1:10-CV-696

---

Before SMITH, DENNIS, and HAYNES, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Edward DeShan Smith ("Smith") sued the "Giddings, Texas Lee County Sheriff's Department," Sheriff Deputies Carvin, Easley and Robertson (the "Deputies"), and Mariel Dawson ("Dawson") for alleged civil rights violations arising out of an incident when Dawson, Smith's home healthcare provider, summoned law enforcement (the Deputies) to Smith's home. The district court

---

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

No. 12-50121

dismissed the “Giddings, Texas Lee County Sheriff’s Department” and Dawson early in the litigation. That order is not appealed.<sup>1</sup>

Only Deputy Carvin appeared in the litigation. Deputies Easley and Robertson were never served. Accordingly, the latter were dismissed without prejudice for want of prosecution. Deputy Carvin filed a motion for summary judgment to which Smith failed to respond. The district court noted the lack of response but also addressed the motion on its merits and granted the motion. This timely appeal followed.

On appeal, Smith makes various conclusory and unsupported accusations of bias against the district judge. He cites no case authority and provides no analysis of any alleged deficiencies in the district court’s reasoning. While pro se litigants are afforded the benefit of liberal construction, they are still required to brief arguments. *Yohey v. Collins*, 985 F.2d 222, 224-25 (5th Cir. 1993). Smith wholly fails to meet even the most minimal of briefing standards; we therefore treat his arguments as abandoned. *Id.*

AFFIRMED.

---

<sup>1</sup> Smith’s notice of appeal listed only the order “entered February 3, 2012,” which we assume to be a reference to the court’s dismissal order directed to the Deputies and dated February 1, 2012. The order dismissing the Lee County Sheriff’s Department and Dawson was dated February 22, 2011. Even if we construed the Notice of Appeal to reach that order, Smith fails to address the district court’s reasoning in entering that dismissal and, thus, his arguments about that order would fail for the same reason as his arguments about the Deputies.