

United States Court of Appeals  
for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

August 14, 2020

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

---

No. 19-20387  
Summary Calendar

---

MICHAEL-FRANCIS PALMA,

*Plaintiff—Appellant,*

*versus*

STATE OF TEXAS; ROLANDO PABLOS, STATE OF TEXAS; MURL  
E. MILLER, STATE OF TEXAS COMPTROLLER; ROLAND  
ALTINGER, HARRIS COUNTY APPRAISAL DISTRICT; RONNIE  
THOMAS, HARRIS COUNTY APPRAISAL REVIEW BOARD; ANN  
HARRIS BENNETT, HARRIS COUNTY TAX ASSESSOR -  
COLLECTOR; JUDICIARY DEFENDANTS, STATE OF TEXAS;  
HARRIS COUNTY DISTRICT CLERK; SENATE SELECT  
COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY TAX REFORM, STATE OF TEXAS;  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON STATE AFFAIRS, STATE OF TEXAS;  
TEXAS JUDICIAL COUNSEL; HARRIS COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE  
IN REM DEFENDANTS,

*Defendants—Appellees.*

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Southern District of Texas  
USDC No. 4:18-CV-4561

---

No. 19-20387

Before JOLLY, ELROD, and GRAVES, *Circuit Judges*.

PER CURIAM:\*

Michael-Francis Palma appeals the dismissal of his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint in which he sought damages and other relief for violations of his civil rights in connection with the collection of property taxes. The district court dismissed the action after finding that Palma failed to prosecute his claim and failed to comply with a court order.

The pro se brief filed by Palma does not address the sole issue on appeal, which is whether the district court erred by dismissing his complaint for the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, it is as if he did not appeal the issue. See *Brinkmann v. Dallas County Deputy Sheriff Abner*, 813 F.2d 744, 748 (5th Cir. 1987). Although pro se briefs are afforded liberal construction, *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972), even pro se litigants must brief arguments in order to preserve them, *Yohey v. Collins*, 985 F.2d 222, 224-25 (5th Cir. 1993). Because Palma has not identified any error in the district court's analysis underlying the dismissal of his civil action, his appeal is DISMISSED AS FRIVOLOUS.

---

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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