

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 95-40400  
Conference Calendar

---

TYRONE HALL,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

ROGER D. ADAIR, CO3; DAVID C. BROWN, CO3;  
RICHARD L. JACKSON, JR., Sergeant,

Defendants-Appellees.

- - - - -  
Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of Texas  
USDC No. 6:94-CV-524  
- - - - -

(October 18, 1995)

Before POLITZ, Chief Judge, and REAVLEY and SMITH, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

In four sparse paragraphs, Tyrone Hall requests this court to appoint counsel because Hall is a layman, asks for a new trial with a jury, makes generalized allegations concerning his confinement unrelated to the specific allegations of his lawsuit, and conclusionally states that the defendants violated the law. "Although we liberally construe briefs of pro se litigants and apply less stringent standards to parties proceeding pro se than

---

\* Local Rule 47.5 provides: "The publication of opinions that have no precedential value and merely decide particular cases on the basis of well-settled principles of law imposes needless expense on the public and burdens on the legal profession." Pursuant to that Rule, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published.

to parties represented by counsel, pro se parties must still brief the issues and reasonably comply with the standards of [Fed. R. App. P.] 28." Grant v. Cuellar, 59 F.3d 523, 524 (5th Cir. 1995) (footnote omitted). Hall's brief does not reasonably comply with Rule 28, and it does not contain argument challenging the district court's final judgment. See Rule 28(a).

To the extent that Hall attempts to raise issues and argue them in his reply brief, the arguments come too late. See Yohey v. Collins, 985 F.2d 222, 225 (5th Cir. 1993). Hall cannot raise an issue for the first time in his reply brief, but he may respond to arguments raised in the appellees' brief. See Stephens v. C.I.T. Group/Equip. Fin., Inc., 955 F.2d 1023, 1026 (5th Cir. 1992).

Because Hall fails to present arguments in his original brief, his appeal is dismissed for failure to prosecute. See Grant, 59 F.3d at 525 n.7; 5th Cir. R. 42.3.2.

We caution Hall that any additional frivolous or wholly insufficient appeals filed by him or on his behalf will invite the imposition of sanctions. To avoid sanctions, Hall is further cautioned to review all pending appeals to ensure that they do not raise arguments that are frivolous because they have been previously decided by this court.

DISMISSED. ADMONITION ISSUED.