

United States Court of Appeals  
for the Fifth Circuit

---

No. 25-11152

---

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

June 8, 2026

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

MICHAEL JOSEPH FRERICKS, II,

*Plaintiff—Appellant,*

*versus*

ROCKWALL COUNTY; KENDA CULPEPPER; COURT APPOINTED  
ATTORNEY; TERRY GARRETT,

*Defendants—Appellees.*

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of Texas  
USDC No. 3:25-CV-2148

---

Before JONES, RICHMAN, and RAMIREZ, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:\*

Michael Joseph Frericks, II moves for leave to proceed in forma pauperis (IFP) on appeal from the sua sponte dismissal of his civil rights action and the denial of his requests for injunctive relief. The 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).

---

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

No. 25-11152

In his briefing, Frericks does not mention the claims he raised against the defendants in his civil action or his requests for injunctive relief, much less challenge the district court's reasons for determining that he failed to state a claim on which relief can be granted or for denying injunctive relief. While pro se briefs are afforded liberal construction, *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). Where, as here, 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). Frericks has abandoned the critical issues by failing to brief them. *See Yohey*, 985 F.2d at 224-25. He has failed to demonstrate that his appeal will involve a nonfrivolous issue. *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. Frericks's motion to amend the caption is DENIED.