

United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

No. 24-20559
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

October 17, 2025

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

LOUIS GALYNSKY,

Plaintiff—Appellant,

versus

JANEICE THOMAS; LUKE VANNORMAN; MOLLY McCUTCHEN;
OFFICER NANNY; OFFICER BECKER; MONTGOMERY COUNTY
JAIL PRISON GUARD/CORRECTIONAL OFFICER,

Defendants—Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Texas
USDC No. 4:24-CV-202

Before BARKSDALE, GRAVES, and DUNCAN, *Circuit Judges*.

PER CURIAM:*

Louis Galynsky, proceeding *pro se* in the district court and on appeal, challenges the dismissal of his constitutional, federal, and state-law claims. They arise out of his arrest, prosecution, and pre-trial incarceration preceding his conviction under Texas Penal Code § 38.15 (interference with

* This opinion is not designated for publication. *See* 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.

No. 24-20559

public duties). He asserts the court erred by dismissing his claims against: the “Montgomery County Jail Prison Guard/Correctional Officer”, *inter alia*, with prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) (failure to state claim); and against Officers Nanny and Becker without prejudice under Rule 12(b)(4) (insufficient process). Our court reviews his assertions *de novo*. *E.g., Miller v. Sam Houston State Univ.*, 986 F.3d 880, 888 (5th Cir. 2021). His contentions are without merit.

Regarding his first contention, he offered only conclusory allegations that he was harmed by the unidentified officer, and his claims were devoid of factual support and critical details. He failed to, *inter alia*, allege facts concerning: the identity of the officer; the factual circumstances surrounding his mistreatment; or how the officer’s actions constituted religious discrimination. The court was not required to accept his cursory and unsupported allegations. *E.g., Harmon v. City of Arlington, Tex.*, 16 F.4th 1159, 1162–63 (5th Cir. 2021).

Moreover, Galynsky first raised the dismissal of his claims against Officers Nanny and Becker in his reply brief. Those contentions are therefore abandoned. *E.g., Tex. Democratic Party v. Benkiser*, 459 F.3d 582, 594 (5th Cir. 2006).

Galynsky has also abandoned, by failing to brief, any assertions regarding the dismissal of his claims against defendants Thomas, VanNorman, and McCutchen. *E.g., Brinkmann v. Dall. Cnty. Deputy Sheriff Abner*, 813 F.2d 744, 748 (5th Cir. 1987).

AFFIRMED.