

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

No. 18-30334

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

February 12, 2019

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

ALONZO GERALD RICHARDSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

BOSSIER CASINO VENTURE, INCORPORATED,

Defendant - Appellee

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Louisiana
USDC No. 5:16-CV-1610

Before KING, HIGGINSON, and COSTA, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Alonzo Gerald Richardson, proceeding *pro se*, appeals the district court's grant of summary judgment to Bossier Casino Venture, Inc. (BCV). Richardson alleges that BCV subjected him to a hostile work environment based on his sex, race, and color, and retaliated against him after he complained about harassment, all in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. We affirm.

* 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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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. 18-30334

“Although we liberally construe the briefs of pro se appellants, we also require that arguments must be briefed to be preserved.” *Hernandez v. Thaler*, 630 F.3d 420, 426 n.24 (5th Cir. 2011) (quoting *Yohey v. Collins*, 985 F.2d 222, 225 (5th Cir. 1993)). The “Argument” section of Richardson’s opening brief states, in its entirety, that: “(1) There is a genuine dispute as to material facts. (2) The material facts would affect the outcome of the suit under governing law. (3) The court did not view the facts drawing all inferences most favorable to the party opposing the motion.” Richardson asks the court to review the evidence he submitted to the district court, but he does not point to specific facts in the record that would create a genuine issue for trial. *See Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 324 (1986); *see also Willis v. Cleco Corp.*, 749 F.3d 314, 319 (5th Cir. 2014) (finding a claim waived when the appellant failed to “explain, in any perceptible manner, why the facts would allow a reasonable jury to decide in his favor”). Richardson’s claims are inadequately briefed, and therefore forfeited. *Id.*

The judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.