

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 99-30717  
Conference Calendar

---

RUSSELL M. FRAISE,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

MICHAEL KELLY, Executive Director of Housing Authority of New Orleans (HANO); RONALD MASON, Executive Monitor of the Housing Authority of New Orleans (HANO); ANDREW CUOMO, Secretary of HUD,

Defendants-Appellees.

-----  
Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of Louisiana  
USDC No. 98-CV-1863-C  
-----

June 16, 2000

Before JOLLY, DAVIS, and DUHÉ, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Russell M. Fraise, a non-prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis (IFP), appeals the district court's dismissal of his civil rights complaint against two officials of the Housing Authority of New Orleans (HANO) and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

The district court dismissed Fraise's complaint against the Secretary of HUD without prejudice based on Fraise's failure to raise any allegations particular to HUD. The court subsequently

---

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

dismissed the remaining HANO defendants, concluding that Fraise had no constitutionally protected right to a specific contract with HANO.

Fraise argues that the district court erred in dismissing his claim without the introduction of any evidence and he asks whether a verifiable violation of law can be overlooked by the court in making a determination to dismiss. He argues that the cases cited by HANO had no bearing on the charges filed, that the trial court erred in allowing HANO to avoid discovery, and he challenges the denial of his request for appointed counsel.

Fraise's brief contains no record citations and no citations to legal authorities. Although this court liberally construes the briefs of pro se litigants, pro se parties must still brief the issues and comply with the standards of Rule 28 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. Grant v. Cuellar, 59 F.3d 523, 524 (5th Cir. 1995). The Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure require the parties to provide references to the page number of the record to support statements of fact. Fed. R. App. P. 28(a)(7) and (9)(A); 5TH CIR. R. 28.2.3. Rule 28(a)(9)(A) also requires the argument to contain citations to the authorities relied on. Fraise's brief contains no record citations, no citation to relevant legal authority, and no identification of any error in the district court's legal analysis that his allegations, accepted as true, did not state a due process claim. Fraise has not adequately briefed any argument relating to the district court's reasons for dismissal. Failure by the appellant to identify any error in the district

court's analysis or application to the facts of the case is the same as if the appellant had not appealed that judgment.

Brinkmann v. Dallas County Deputy Sheriff Abner, 813 F.2d 744, 748 (5th Cir. 1987).

Fraise's appeal is inadequately briefed, and we thus DISMISS the appeal as frivolous. 5TH CIR. R. 42.2.