

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

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

July 3, 2019

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

No. 18-40721
Summary Calendar

STEPHEN RICHARDSON,

Plaintiff-Appellant

v.

JUDGE JUANITA VASQUEZ GARDNER; TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF
CRIMINAL JUSTICE RECORDS CLERK; TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF
CRIMINAL JUSTICE GRIEVANCE DEPARTMENT; PAROLE OFFICER
EDNIKA WILLIAMS; WARDEN LARRY E. BERGER,

Defendants-Appellees

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Texas
USDC No. 3:18-CV-65

Before JONES, HIGGINSON, and OLDHAM, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Stephen Richardson, Texas prisoner # 1795088, appeals the dismissal of his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted and for seeking money damages from defendants who are immune from such relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2)(B) and 1915A(b).

* 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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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. 18-40721

He has also filed a motion for leave to file a supplemental brief, which is GRANTED.

When an appellant fails to identify any error in the district court's analysis, it is the same as if the appellant had not appealed that issue. *Brinkmann v. Dallas Cnty. Deputy Sheriff Abner*, 813 F.2d 744, 748 (5th Cir. 1987). Although this court liberally construes pro se briefs, "even pro se litigants must brief arguments in order to preserve them." *Mapes v. Bishop*, 541 F.3d 582, 584 (5th Cir. 2008) (citing *Yohey v. Collins*, 985 F.2d 222, 224-25 (5th Cir. 1993) and FED. R. APP. P. 28(a)(9)). Because Richardson does not mention, much less meaningfully address, the district court's conclusion that his § 1983 claims were barred by *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477 (1994), or, in the alternative, that Judge Juanita Vasquez-Gardner and District Attorney Bill Pennington were entitled to absolute immunity and that Alex Scharff was not a state actor who could be held liable under § 1983, Richardson has abandoned the only cognizable issues on appeal. *See Mapes*, 541 F.3d at 584; *Brinkmann*, 813 F.2d at 748.

The judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.