

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 94-50219  
Conference Calendar

---

OTUMA AGADAGA,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

BEN KEELE, Sheriff, Ward  
Co., ET AL.,

Defendants-Appellees.

- - - - -  
Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Texas  
USDC No. P-93-CV-58

- - - - -  
(November 15, 1994)

Before JONES, DUHÉ, and PARKER, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

"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, 225 (5th Cir. 1993) (internal quotations omitted). Although this Court liberally construes the briefs of pro se appellants, Price v. Digital Equip. Corp., 846 F.2d 1026, 1028 (5th Cir. 1988), the Court requires arguments to be briefed in order to be preserved.

---

\* 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 Pursuant to that Rule, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published.

Yohey, 985 F.2d at 225. Even if the appellant is proceeding pro se, claims not adequately argued in the body of the brief are deemed abandoned on appeal. See id. at 224-25. General arguments giving only broad standards of review and not citing to specific errors are insufficient to preserve issues for appeal. See Brinkmann v. Dallas County Deputy Sheriff Abner, 813 F.2d 744, 748 (5th Cir. 1987).

Otuma Agadaga's brief does not satisfy the requirements of Fed. R. App. P. 28(a)(4). Agadaga lists four issues under the heading "Issues Presented": 1) whether the district court abused its discretion by dismissing his complaint on the "very date" that he received the magistrate judge's report and recommendation; 2) whether he was prejudiced by the district court's failure to consider his affidavit and objections to the magistrate judge's report and recommendations; 3) whether his complaint presented a claim upon which relief could be granted; and 4) whether the defendants were entitled to qualified immunity as officers of a municipality. Agadaga's listing of his issues on appeal constitutes his sole legal argument.

Under the heading "Facts of the case," Agadaga directs the Court to his affidavit contained in the record. Under the heading "Argument," Agadaga states that he does not have access to a law library and directs the Court to consider the exhibits, complaint, pleadings, responses, and objections to the recommendations.

Agadaga makes no specific legal arguments regarding any alleged errors committed by the district court. Because

Agadaga's claims are not adequately argued in the body of his brief, they are deemed abandoned on appeal. This appeal presents no issue of arguable merit and is thus frivolous. Howard v. King, 707 F.2d 215, 219-20 (5th Cir. 1983). Because the appeal is frivolous, it is dismissed. 5th Cir. R. 42.2.

DISMISSED.