

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 94-60199  
Conference Calendar

---

WILLIAM MONTGOMERY,

Petitioner-Appellant,

versus

EDWARD M. HARGETT, Superintendent,  
Mississippi State Penitentiary,

Respondent-Appellee.

- - - - -  
Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of Mississippi  
USDC No. CA-3:93-41  
- - - - -

(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 pro se briefs, see Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520, 92 S. Ct. 594, 39 L. Ed. 2d 652 (1972), we require arguments to be briefed in order to be preserved. Yohey, 985

---

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 Pursuant to that Rule, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published.

F.2d at 225. 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).

Montgomery fails to satisfy these requirements. Under the guise of an appellate brief, he offers a rambling recitation of general legal precepts. He lists no issues nor makes any specific legal arguments regarding any alleged errors committed by the district court. He offers no argument that could be construed as an appellate argument addressing cause and prejudice within the procedural-bar context. 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.

The appellee's motion to strike appellant's brief for failure to comply with Fed. R. App. P. 28(a) is DENIED as moot, as are appellant's motions for the appointment of counsel, to expedite the appeal, and for disciplinary action against appellee's counsel.

APPEAL DISMISSED; ALL MOTIONS DENIED.