

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 97-31238
Conference Calendar

DAVID SINGLETON,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

BURL CAIN, Warden; MOORE;
BARNES; JOHN DOE, Medical Staff,
Security,

Defendants-Appellees.

- - - - -
Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Middle District of Louisiana
USDC No. 697-CV-628

- - - - -
February 12, 1998

Before SMITH, EMILIO M. GARZA, and DeMOSS, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

David Singleton, Louisiana state prisoner #81080, has filed an appeal from the district court's dismissal of his 42 U. S. C. § 1983 suit for failure to comply with a court order and from the denial of his motion for reconsideration; nevertheless, Singleton has failed to brief any issues related to the district court's orders. Although this court construes pro se pleadings liberally, pro se litigants must abide by the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. See United States v. Wilkes, 20 F.3d 651, 653 (5th Cir. 1994). The Rules require that the appellant's

* Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

argument contain the reasons he deserves the requested relief "with citation to the authorities, statutes, and parts of the record relied on." FED. R. APP. P. 28(a)(6). A statement of the applicable standard of review is also required. Id.

Failure to comply with the court's rules regarding the contents of briefs can be grounds for dismissing a party's appeal. 5TH CIR. R. 42.3.2. Because Singleton has failed to brief the only viable issues in this appeal, the appeal has no arguable merit and is therefore frivolous. Because the appeal is frivolous, it is DISMISSED. 5TH CIR. R. 42.2.

Because of the dismissal of Singleton's appeal as frivolous, the motion for appointment of counsel is DENIED as unnecessary.