

United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

October 5, 2022

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

No. 22-10076
Summary Calendar

HANNAH LOGAN; HENRY O. LOGAN,

Plaintiffs—Appellants,

versus

JEROME HENNIGAN, *324 Family Law Judge,*

Defendant—Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Texas
USDC No. 4:21-CV-749

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, GRAVES, and HO, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:*

Hannah and Henry Logan appeal the district court's dismissal of their complaint alleging civil rights violations and violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act against Judge Jerome Hennigan, the presiding judge of the

* Pursuant to 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5.4.

No. 22-10076

324th Judicial District Court of Tarrant County, Texas, for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

The Logans' appellate brief does not meaningfully address the basis for the district court's dismissal. While pro se briefs are liberally construed, *see Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972), even pro se litigants must brief arguments in order to preserve them, *Yohey v. Collins*, 985 F.2d 222, 224-25 (5th Cir. 1993). The Logans' failure to address the basis for the district court's dismissal, "without even the slightest identification of any error in [the court's] legal analysis or its application to [their] suit . . . is the same as if [they] had not appealed that judgment." *Brinkmann v. Dallas Cnty. Deputy Sheriff Abner*, 813 F.2d 744, 748 (5th Cir. 1987).

The district court judgment is AFFIRMED. The Logans' pending motions for appointment of counsel, for summary judgment, to expedite the appeal, and for exemption of PACER fees are DENIED. *See Ulmer v. Chancellor*, 691 F.2d 209, 212-13 (5th Cir. 1982).