

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

No. 15-10042
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

April 6, 2016

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

DELORIS PHILLIPS,

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

CITY OF DALLAS, also known as The "One"/ "Oneness" Entity; DALLAS POLICE DEPARTMENT, also known as The "One"/ "Oneness" Entity; UNITED PARCEL SERVICE, INCORPORATED, also known as The "One"/ "Oneness" Entity; FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, also known as The "One"/ "Oneness" Entity; MICHAEL RAWLINGS, Dallas Mayor (connection to "one"/"oneness"); DAVID BROWN, D.P.D Police Chief (connection to "one"/"oneness"); HERB COTNER, D.P.D. Corporal (connection to "one"/"oneness"),

Defendants - Appellees

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Texas
USDC No. 3:14-CV-3131

Before JOLLY, DENNIS, and PRADO, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

* Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

No. 15-10042

Proceeding *pro se*, Deloris Phillips appeals the district court's dismissal of all of her claims against Defendants. The district court dismissed, with prejudice, Phillips's claims against the Federal Bureau of Investigation pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) upon concluding that Phillips failed to plead facts sufficient to support any claim for relief and that the claims were duplicative of previous filings. The district court dismissed the claims against all of the other Defendants pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) upon concluding that the claims were factually frivolous and malicious. In addition, the district court modified already-existing sanctions against Phillips to prevent Phillips from filing, removing, or transferring any litigation in the Northern District of Texas without first obtaining leave from a district court judge.

In her brief on appeal, Phillips fails to address the district court's reasons for dismissing her claims, does not adequately argue why she is entitled to any relief, and does not include a statement of issues presented for review. Although we must liberally construe the briefs of *pro se* litigants, "*pro se* parties must still brief the issues and reasonably comply with the standards of Rule 28." *Grant v. Cuellar*, 59 F.3d 523, 524 (5th Cir. 1995). By failing to address the district court's reasoning, adequately argue entitlement to relief, and include a statement of issues presented for review, Phillips's appeal fails to comply with the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. *See Toala v. Marriott White Lodging Corp.*, 456 F. App'x 476, 477 (5th Cir. 2012). Therefore, we DISMISS the appeal for want of prosecution. *See id.* All pending motions are DENIED.