

June 24, 2003

Charles R. Fulbruge III
Clerk

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 02-60615
Conference Calendar

JOSUE LEMUS-AZANON,

Petitioner,

versus

JOHN ASHCROFT, U.S. ATTORNEY GENERAL,

Respondent.

Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals
BIA No. A76-311-827

Before DeMOSS, DENNIS, and PRADO, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Josue Lemus-Azanon has petitioned for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing his appeal from the decision of the immigration judge denying his asylum application. The appellant's brief must contain an argument, which in turn must contain his "contentions and the reasons for them, with citations to the authorities and parts of the record on which the appellant relies" and "for each issue, a concise statement of the applicable standard of review." FED. R. APP. P. 28(a)(9); see

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

Yohey v. Collins, 985 F.2d 222, 225 (5th Cir. 1993). 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).

Lemus-Azanon's brief fails to meet this standard. Lemus-Azanon, in a two-paragraph argument, conclusionally asserts that the immigration judge erred in finding that the presumption of a well-founded fear of future persecution had been rebutted. Moreover, he fails to identify any specific error in the immigration judge's analysis and fails to present an argument that contains the reasons he deserves the requested relief with citation to the authorities. See Yohey, 985 F.2d at 225; Brinkmann, 813 F.2d at 748. The remainder of Lemus-Azanon's 18-page brief consists of boilerplate law and citations to numerous cases. However, Lemus-Azanon does not apply either the facts or the analyses of those cases to his case. The petition for review is DENIED.

PETITION DENIED.