

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

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

September 15, 2009

No. 08-31175  
Summary Calendar

Charles R. Fulbruge III  
Clerk

PATSY LOUVIERE,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

MICHAEL J. ASTRUE, Commissioner of Social Security,

Defendant-Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Louisiana  
No. 2:07-CV-549

---

Before DAVIS, SMITH, and DENNIS, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Patsy Louviere sought judicial review of a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security denying her claim for supplemental security income

---

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

payments under title XVI of the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 416(i), 1382c. The magistrate judge prepared a thorough and convincing Report and Recommendation, suggesting that the decision of the Commissioner be affirmed and that the complaint be dismissed. The district court agreed and entered judgment accordingly; Louviere appeals.

It is doubtful that, in her short brief, Louviere—even given the extra latitude we accord *pro se* litigants—has presented her issues on appeal with sufficient argument to comply with the applicable rules. She gives a one-page “Statement of the Case” in which she states her claimed disability and inability to find work. She presents no argument as such but states the following as her “Summary of Argument”:

In summary one of your own doctors, Dr. Galloway, has stated that he finds me to be disabled. I am requesting that the 5<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court of Appeals helps me by reversing Judge Astrue’s decision and Gran[t] me disability compensation, and con[]sider me disabled[.] See attached ex[h]ibit showin[g] degenerative disease.

Assuming, only for the sake of argument, that the foregoing is sufficient to raise the issue of whether and how the district court or the Commissioner erred, we find no error. The judgment denying relief is AFFIRMED, essentially for the reasons given by the magistrate judge and adopted by the district court.