

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 93-7406  
Conference Calendar

---

JEFFERY ANDERSON,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

YAZOO CITY COUNTY JAIL,

Defendant-Appellee.

- - - - -  
Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Southern District of Mississippi  
USDC No. CA-W91-0021(BR)(C)  
- - - - -  
(September 23, 1994)

Before KING, SMITH, and BENAVIDES, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Jeffery Anderson commenced this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action against the "Yazoo City County Jail." Anderson alleged that, on December 20, 1989, Detective Mike Wallace of the Yazoo City, Mississippi, Police Department beat a confession out of him at the Yazoo City Jail. The magistrate judge issued a report and recommendation, finding that Anderson failed to prove that Wallace beat him at any time. The district court adopted the

---

\* Local Rule 47.5 provides: "The publication of opinions that have no precedential value and merely decide particular cases on the basis of well-settled principles of law imposes needless expense on the public and burdens on the legal profession." Pursuant to that Rule, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published.

magistrate judge's report and recommendation over Anderson's objection. This appeal followed.

"Fed. R. App. P. 28(a)(4) requires that the appellant's argument contain the reasons he deserves the requested relief with citation to the authorities, statutes and parts of the record relied on." Yohey v. Collins, 985 F.2d 222, 224 (5th Cir. 1993) (internal quotations omitted). Although this Court liberally construes pro se briefs, the Court requires arguments to be briefed in order to be preserved. Id. Claims not adequately argued in the body of the brief are deemed abandoned on appeal. See Yohey, 985 F.2d at 225. General arguments giving only broad standards of review and not citing to specific errors are insufficient to preserve issues for appeal. See Brinkmann v. Abner, 813 F.2d 744, 748 (5th Cir. 1987).

Anderson's brief fails to satisfy these requirements. It simply reasserts Anderson's factual allegations against Wallace, it contains no reference to the portions of the transcript which support the allegations, and it fails to identify how the district court erred in granting judgment for Wallace. Even if we construe Anderson's brief as attacking the magistrate judge's factual finding, the record reveals that the finding was not clearly erroneous. See Odom v. Frank, 3 F.3d 839, 843 (5th Cir. 1993). We therefore dismiss the appeal as frivolous because it does not present an issue of arguable legal merit. See Howard v. King, 707 F.2d 215, 219-20 (5th Cir. 1983); 5th Cir. R. 42.2.

DISMISSED.