

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 98-60461  
Conference Calendar

---

MAURICE WESTRIDGE,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

MOISE STEEG, JR.; RANDY OPOTOWSKY;  
BERNARD BERINS; THOMAS H. KINGSMILL,  
JUDGE,

Defendants-Appellees.

-----  
Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Southern District of Mississippi  
USDC No. 3:98-CV-250-LN  
-----

August 27, 1999

Before KING, Chief Judge, and JOLLY and DAVIS, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Maurice Westridge appeals the district court's dismissal of a complaint he brought against Moise Steeg, Jr., Randy Opotowsky, Bernard Berins, and Bankruptcy Judge Thomas H. Kingsmill. Westridge has failed to brief whether the district court erred in dismissing his complaint due to lack of personal jurisdiction, improper venue, and judicial immunity; he asserts simply that diversity jurisdiction was proper.

---

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

General arguments that do not cite to specific errors are insufficient to preserve issues for appeal.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). "Failure to provide any legal or factual analysis results in waiver." American States Ins. Co. v. Bailey, 133 F.3d 363, 372 (5th Cir. 1998). Failure to present any authority in support of an argument results in an abandonment of the issue. United States v. Heacock, 31 F.3d 249, 258 (5th Cir. 1994). Even construing Westridge's brief liberally, we find the brief to be insufficient. Because Westridge has not provided this court with any legal or factual analysis, we DISMISS the appeal as frivolous. Yohey v. Collins, 985 F.2d 222, 225 (5th Cir. 1993); 5th Cir. R. 42.2.

APPEAL DISMISSED.