

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

June 15, 2012

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

No. 11-60584
Summary Calendar

ANATOLIA GARCIA,

Petitioner

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., U.S. ATTORNEY GENERAL,

Respondent

Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals
BIA No. A094 184 297

Before WIENER, GARZA, and SOUTHWICK, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Petitioner Anatolia Garcia, a native and citizen of Mexico, seeks review of the decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA), dismissing her appeal from the Removal Order of the immigration judge (IJ) and the IJ's determination that she was ineligible for cancellation of removal or temporary protected status. Garcia contends that, even though she did not accrue the 10 years of continuous physical presence necessary to be eligible for cancellation of removal, it is possible that the Department of Homeland Security purposefully served her with

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

No. 11-60584

a premature Notice to Appear to preclude her from satisfying the 10-year requirement. She also claims that she was eligible for temporary protected status because she qualified as a derivative beneficiary of the application submitted by her qualified husband.

We conclude that Garcia has abandoned her claims by failing to brief them sufficiently. Pursuant to Rule 28(a)(9)(A) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, an appellant's filings must set forth the reasons for the relief requested with citation to the authorities, statutes, and parts of the record on which she relies. Garcia's attorney-prepared brief fails to meet this standard: It contains only a perfunctory summary of the claims that Garcia seeks to assert on appeal without reference to relevant legal authority or citations to the record. Furthermore, Garcia does not address the bases on which the IJ and the BIA denied her claims and fails to identify any specific error purportedly committed by the IJ or the BIA. As Garcia has not offered a meaningful factual discussion or legal analysis, she has effectively waived her claims for relief. *See* Rule 28(a)(9)(B); *Soadjede v. Ashcroft*, 324 F.3d 830, 833 (5th Cir. 2003) (holding that arguments not briefed are abandoned).

Accordingly, Garcia's petition for review is DENIED.