

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

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

October 31, 2013

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

---

No. 13-10169  
Summary Calendar

---

MARGARET ELIZABETH BRODERICK-HOME, also known as Margaret Elizabeth Broderick, also known as M. Elizabeth Broderick,

Plaintiff

MARSHALL HOME,

Appellant

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; ROBERT MISKELL; DARION FISHMAN;  
ANN BIRMINGHAM SCHEEL; UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS; ET AL,

Defendants-Appellees

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of Texas  
USDC No. 4:12-CV-373

---

Before BENAVIDES, CLEMENT, and OWEN, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Marshall Home, federal prisoner # 56200-008, appeals the district court's denial of his motion to reconsider and the denial of his supplemental motion to

---

\* 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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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. 13-10169

reconsider. Through these motions, Home sought to have the district court reopen the civil proceeding filed by Margaret Elizabeth Broderick-Home, formerly federal prisoner # 07018-112, and allow Home to substitute as the plaintiff. Following Broderick-Home's death, the district court had dismissed Broderick-Home's case without prejudice pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 25(a)(1), as no party or successor or representative of Broderick-Home's estate filed a motion to substitute within 90 days of her death.

Home has failed to brief any challenge to the reasons for the district court's denial of his motion for reconsideration and his supplemental motion. Although pro se briefs are afforded liberal construction, *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). Because Home has failed to brief the only issue for appeal, he has abandoned any arguments regarding the denial of his motions. *See id.*; *see also Brinkmann v. Dallas County Deputy Sheriff Abner*, 813 F.2d 744, 748 (5th Cir. 1987). Accordingly, the judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.