William Oliver v. Ban Casse: 13-60161 Document: 00512503248 Page: 1 Date Filed: 01/16/2014boc. 512503248

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit

FILED

No. 13-60161 Summary Calendar Lyle W. Cayce Clerk

January 16, 2014

WILLIAM H. OLIVER,

Plaintiff-Appellant/Cross-Appellee,

v.

BANKFIRST,

Defendant-Appellee,

BILL SKINNER,

Defendant-Appellee, Cross-Appellant.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi USDC No. 4:09-CV-29

Before DAVIS, SOUTHWICK, and HIGGINSON, Circuit Judges. PER CURIAM:*

Pro se plaintiff William H. Oliver appeals from the dismissal, much earlier in this proceeding, of all his claims relating to the defendants' actions

^{*} 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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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. 13-60161

concerning Oliver's former property following a foreclosure sale. Oliver's brief, such as it is, consists of a short series of conclusory statements without any legal or factual analysis. "Failure to provide any legal or factual analysis of an issue results in waiver." While we construe *pro se* briefs liberally, *pro se* plaintiffs are still required to adequately brief issues for review. ² Accordingly, we dismiss Oliver's appeal.

Defendant-appellee and cross-appellant Bill Skinner appeals from the district court's judgment, following a bench trial, dismissing Skinner's counterclaims, including abuse of process, attorney's fees, costs, sanctions, and injunctive relief. As Skinner concedes in his brief, our review on these issues is for abuse of discretion, and our review of the facts is limited to clear error.³ We find no abuse of discretion or clear error in any part of the district court's order supporting its final judgment.⁴ We specifically note that the district court granted Skinner's motion for Rule 11 sanctions and imposed sanctions in the amount of \$250 against Oliver.⁵ We will not upset this award.

Accordingly, we affirm the final judgment of the district court.

American States Ins. Co. v. Bailey, 133 F.3d 363, 372 (5th Cir. 1998).

² See Grant v. Cuellar, 59 F.3d 523, 524 (5th Cir. 1995).

³ See United States v. Mississippi, 921 F.2d 604, 609 (5th Cir. 1991).

Id.