

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 95-30589

HENRY JAMES,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

TERRY TERRELL, Warden;
MILLER, Sergeant;
B. THOMPSON, Sergeant,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Louisiana
(CA-94-0410)

May 07, 1996

Before POLITZ, Chief Judge, JONES, and BARKSDALE, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Henry James ("James"), an inmate of the Allen Correctional Center, has appealed the dismissal of his civil rights action for failure to state a claim against Warden Terry Terrell and two correctional officers.

As his appellate brief, James offers no additional argument whatsoever on any of the asserted legal issues, but rather merely files a Xerox copy of his supplemental civil rights

Pursuant to Local Rule 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in Local Rule 47.5.4.

complaint, his motion for leave to file it, his opposition to a memorandum filed by the defendants, and the prayer for relief of his original complaint.

Nowhere in this purported appellate brief does James either state or argue any issue on appeal before this court. As a result, this court AFFIRMS the judgment of the district court without considering it on its merits. See *Al-Ra'id v. Ingle*, 69 F.3d 28 (5th Cir. 1995) (holding that “[a]n appellant’s brief must contain an argument on the issues that are raised, in order that we, as a reviewing court, may know what action of the district court is being complained of. There is no exemption for pro se litigants, though we construe their briefs liberally.”) (citations omitted); *Weaver v. Puckett*, 896 F.2d 126 (5th Cir. 1990) (prisoner abandons objection if he does not provide an argument containing the reasons justifying the requested relief “with citation to the authorities, statutes and parts of the record relied on.”) (citations omitted); Fed. R. App. P. 28(a)(6) (requiring that the brief of the appellant contain a developed argument).

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the judgment of the district court dismissing James’ complaint for failure to state a cognizable claim is **AFFIRMED**.