

United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

December 19, 2025

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

No. 25-10512
Summary Calendar

ANGELOS KOLOBOTOS,

Plaintiff—Appellant,

versus

CITY OF DALLAS, *A municipal corporation in the State of Texas*; ALBERT TRE BLACK, III, *Receiver for the property located at 1918 Duluth Street Dallas, Texas*; CHESTNUT HILL HOLDINGS LLC, *Prospective buyer of the property*; CITY OF DALLAS WATER DEPARTMENT; DENNIS ROOSSEIN; 2700 ALW LLC, ADDITIONAL PARTIES INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ATTORNEYS and FIRMS WHO COLLUDED TO DEPRIVE PLAINTIFF OF HIS PROPERTY RIGHTS; CITY OF DALLAS CODE ENFORCEMENT,

Defendants—Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Texas
USDC No. 3:24-CV-3070

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

PER CURIAM:*

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

No. 25-10512

Angelos Kolobotos, proceeding pro se, moves for leave to proceed in forma pauperis (IFP) in this appeal of the district court's dismissal of his case upon granting various defendants' motion to dismiss under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) and sua sponte. Kolobotos also appeals the district court's denial of his various postjudgment motions. Kolobotos's IFP motion is a challenge to the district court's certification that the appeal is not taken in good faith. *See Baugh v. Taylor*, 117 F.3d 197, 202 (5th Cir. 1997).

Kolobotos fails to address the district court's reasons for the dismissal of his complaint. Pro se briefs are afforded liberal construction. *See Yohey v. Collins*, 985 F.2d 222, 225 (5th Cir. 1993). Nevertheless, when an appellant fails to identify any error in the district court's analysis, it is the same as if the appellant had not appealed the decision. *Brinkmann v. Dallas Cnty. Deputy Sheriff Abner*, 813 F.2d 744, 748 (5th Cir. 1987).

Because Kolobotos has failed to meaningfully challenge any factual or legal aspect of the district court's disposition of his claims and dismissal of his complaint, he has abandoned the critical issue of his appeal. *See id.* Thus, the appeal lacks arguable merit. *See Howard v. King*, 707 F.2d 215, 220 (5th Cir. 1983). Accordingly, the motion for leave to proceed IFP is DENIED, and the appeal is DISMISSED as frivolous. *See Baugh*, 117 F.3d at 202 n.24; 5TH CIR. R. 42.2.