

United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

No. 25-50127
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

September 3, 2025

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

ROBERT YEZAK,

Plaintiff—Appellant,

versus

SHERIFF EDDY LANGE; OFFICER WALLACE, *Bell County Law Enforcement Center Officer*; BELL COUNTY LAW ENFORCEMENT CENTER OFFICERS; PHILLIPS, *Bell County Law Enforcement Center Wellpath Med Tech*; WELLPATH MEDICAL PERSONNEL, *Bell County Law Enforcement Center*; FNU PHILLIPS, *Bell County Law Enforcement Center Turnkey Med Tech*; TURNKEY MEDICAL PERSONNEL, *Bell County Law Enforcement Center*; JOHN/JANE DOE, *Blanket Manufacture and Provider to Bell County Law Enforcement Center*,

Defendants—Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Texas
USDC No. 6:24-CV-518

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, ENGELHARDT, and RAMIREZ, *Circuit Judges.*

No. 25-50127

PER CURIAM:*

Robert Yezak, a Texas pretrial detainee, filed a pro se 42 U.S.C. § 1983 civil rights action alleging that defendants were deliberately indifferent to his serious medical needs, that he was subjected to harassment, that he was denied religious rights, and that he has been held in pretrial detention for five years. After determining that Yezak failed to state a claim upon which relief could be granted, the district court dismissed the complaint.

On appeal, Yezak contends that the merits of his case were valid and that his case was dismissed with prejudice before he could develop his arguments. Although pro se filings are afforded liberal construction, even pro se litigants must brief arguments in order to preserve them. *Yohey v. Collins*, 985 F.2d 222, 225 (5th Cir. 1993). By failing to address or identify any error in the district court's determination that he failed to state a claim upon which relief could be granted, Yezak has abandoned any challenge to the dismissal of his complaint. *See Brinkmann v. Dallas Cnty. Deputy Sheriff Abner*, 813 F.2d 744, 748 (5th Cir. 1987).

In light of the foregoing, the judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED, and Yezak's motion for the appointment of counsel is DENIED.

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