IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 94-50345
Conference Calendar

JERRY E. EASLEY,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

CAROL VANCE, Individually
and in their official capacity
as officials of the State of
Texas, acting by and through
the TDCJ-ID, et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

- - - - - - - - - -

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Texas
USDC No. A-93-CV-541

- - - - - - - - - -

(January 27, 1995)

Before POLITZ, Chief Judge, and HIGGINBOTHAM and DeMOSS, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:[*]

Jerry E. Easley appeals the district court's grant of the defendants' motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim under Rule 12(b)(6), which we review de novo. Fernandez-Montes v. Allied Pilots Ass'n, 987 F.2d 278, 284 (5th Cir. 1993). We accept the plaintiff's factual allegations as true. Id. "Unless it appears beyond a doubt that the plaintiff can prove no set of

---

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 Pursuant to that Rule, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published.

facts in support of his claim which would entitle him to relief, the complaint should not be dismissed for failure to state a claim." Id. at 284-85 (internal quotation and citation omitted).

Easley argues only that he is being subjected to slavery and/or involuntary servitude without any statutory or Constitutional authority. He offers no appellate arguments addressing any other issues raised in the district court.

We have explicitly upheld against an involuntary-servitude challenge Texas' practice of making inmates work. Wendt v. Lynaugh, 841 F.2d 619, 620-21 (5th Cir. 1988); see also Murray v. Mississippi Dep't of Corrections, 911 F.2d 1167, 1167-68 (5th Cir. 1990), cert. denied, 498 U.S. 1050 (1991). Further, Texas' practice of making inmates work does not violate the Equal Protection Clause nor constitute cruel and unusual punishment. Wendt, 841 F.2d at 621. Additionally, compensation for inmate labor "is by the grace of the state." Id. (internal quotation and citation omitted). The district court correctly found this claim to be legally frivolous under § 1915(d).

Although we liberally construe pro se briefs, see Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 522, 92 S. Ct. 594, 3 L. Ed. 2d 652 (1972), we require arguments to be briefed in order to be preserved. Yohey v. Collins, 985 F.2d 222, 225 (5th Cir. 1993). Claims not adequately argued in the body of the brief are deemed abandoned on appeal. See id. 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). Concerning the remainder of Easley's claims asserted in the district court, he has failed to satisfy these requirements. Thus, the other issues raised in the district court have been abandoned. Therefore, the district court's § 1915(d) dismissal of Easley's § 1983 complaint is AFFIRMED.

Easley has also filed a "Motion for Leave to Submit Letter Supplement with Memorandum of Law," asserting that since the filing of his original appeal brief, he has discovered, by continuing research, applicable caselaw which he contends we should consider. However, Easley filed lengthy initial and reply briefs, and our precedent regarding his slavery/involuntary servitude argument clearly indicates that there is no legal validity to that challenge. His motion is DENIED.

AFFIRMED; MOTION DENIED.