

United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

No. 26-20088
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

August 27, 2026

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff—Appellee,

versus

LIDUVINA ZUNIGA-SAGRERO,

Defendant—Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Texas
USDC No. 4:23-CR-178-1

Before HAYNES, GRAVES, and RAMIREZ, *Circuit Judges*.

PER CURIAM:*

Liduvina Zuniga-Sagrero, federal prisoner # 55281-510, appeals from the district court's January 22, 2026 order denying her motion for expedited removal. In her appeal brief, she challenges only the district court's prior November 7, 2025 order denying five postconviction motions that she filed.

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

No. 26-20088

Zuniga-Sagrero's notice of appeal makes clear that she intended to appeal only the district court's January 22, 2026 order denying her motion for expedited removal. However, in her appeal brief, she does not even mention the district court's January 22, 2026 order, much less brief any challenge to the district court's denial of her motion for expedited removal. Although Zuniga-Sagrero's pleadings are afforded liberal construction, *see Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972), she still must brief arguments to preserve them, *see Yohey v. Collins*, 985 F.2d 222, 224-25 (5th Cir. 1993). Claims not argued in the body of the brief are deemed abandoned on appeal. *Id.* Zuniga-Sagrero's failure to address the district court's denial of her motion is the same as if she had not challenged the district court's January 22, 2026 order. *See Brinkmann v. Dallas Cnty. Deputy Sheriff Abner*, 813 F.2d 744, 748 (5th Cir. 1987). As such, she has abandoned the only cognizable issues on appeal. *See Yohey*, 985 F.2d at 225. The appeal is therefore AFFIRMED IN PART.

Because Zuniga-Sagrero did not file a notice of appeal from the November 7, 2025 order, we lack jurisdiction to review the November 7, 2025 order. *See C.A. May Marine Supply Co. v. Brunswick Corp.*, 649 F.2d 1049, 1056 (5th Cir. 1981); *see also* FED. R. APP. P. 3(c)(1)(B). The appeal is therefore DISMISSED IN PART.