

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 95-10801
Summary Calendar

GREGORY MONTGOMERY,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

OFFICE C/O PEARCE; OFFICER
C/O 3 FOREE,

Defendants-Appellees.

- - - - -
Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Texas
USDC No. 1:95-CV-24-C
- - - - -
February 7, 1996

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, DUHE' and EMILIO M. GARZA, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Gregory Montgomery filed this appeal from the district court's denial of his FED. R. CIV. P. 60(b) motion; nevertheless, Montgomery has not briefed whether the district court abused its discretion in denying the motion. Although this court liberally construes pro se briefs, see Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972), this court requires arguments to be briefed in order to be preserved. Yohey v. Collins, 985 F.2d 222, 225 (5th Cir.

* Pursuant to Local Rule 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in Local Rule 47.5.4.

1993). Claims not adequately argued in the body of the brief are deemed abandoned on appeal. Id. at 224-25. As Montgomery has abandoned the only appellate issue this court has jurisdiction to address, the appeal is frivolous. See Howard v. King, 707 F.2d 215, 220 (5th Cir. 1983). Because the appeal is frivolous, it is DISMISSED. See 5TH CIR. Rule 42.2.

Montgomery is cautioned that any additional frivolous appeals filed by him will invite the imposition of sanctions. To avoid sanctions, Montgomery is further cautioned to review any pending appeals to ensure that they do not raise arguments that are frivolous because they have been previously decided by this court.

APPEAL DISMISSED.