

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

No. 18-11172
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED
October 3, 2019

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

SERAFINA LICCARDI,

Plaintiff–Appellant,

versus

DELTA PERSONNEL/DELTA STAFFING SERVICES; ROSE LYSKOWSKI;
STANLEY LYSKOWSKI, also known as Stan Pierce,

Defendants–Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Texas
No. 3:16-CV-2537

Before SMITH, COSTA, and HO, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Serafina Liccardi sued *pro se*, and the district court granted the

* 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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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. 18-11172

defendants' motion to dismiss per Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). Liccardi moves to proceed *in forma pauperis* ("IFP") on appeal.

By moving to proceed IFP, Liccardi is challenging the district court's certification that her appeal is not taken in good faith. *See Baugh v. Taylor*, 117 F.3d 197, 202 (5th Cir. 1997). Our inquiry into good faith "is limited to whether the appeal involves legal points arguable on their merits (and therefore not frivolous)." *Howard v. King*, 707 F.2d 215, 220 (5th Cir. 1983) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). We may dismiss the appeal if it is frivolous. *See Baugh*, 117 F.3d at 202 n.24; 5TH CIR. R. 42.2.

Liccardi contends that the defendants breached a *quantum meruit* contract, fraudulently concealed a letter regarding her trust, psychologically coerced her siblings, and converted and embezzled her investments and trusts. Those arguments are supported with inapplicable cases and statutes and do not suffice to show a nonfrivolous issue for appeal. *See Howard*, 707 F.3d at 220.

Liccardi makes other arguments without factual or legal support. She contends that the defendants violated her civil rights, harassed her, and violated her right to privacy. Because Liccardi fails adequately to brief those issues, they are abandoned. *See Yohey v. Collins*, 985 F.2d 222, 224–25 (5th Cir. 1993). Thus, she has failed to show that she will present a nonfrivolous issue for appeal. *See Howard*, 707 F.2d at 220.

Accordingly, the motion to proceed IFP on appeal is DENIED, and the appeal is DISMISSED as frivolous. *See Baugh*, 117 F.3d at 202 n.24; 5TH CIR. R. 42.2.