

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

No. 15-30898
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

April 14, 2016

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

BRENDIA JOYCIA FORD,

Plaintiff–Appellant,

v.

BRITISH PETROLEUM, P.L.C.,

Defendant–Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Louisiana
USDC 2:15-CV-1726

Before JOLLY, DENNIS, and PRADO, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Plaintiff–Appellant Brendia Joycia Ford, proceeding pro se, appeals the dismissal of her claims against Defendant–Appellee British Petroleum, P.L.C. In September 2015, the district court dismissed Ford’s claims pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) for failing to sufficiently allege facts that would support a claim upon which relief can be granted. It also held that

* 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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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. 15-30898

even if Ford had stated a claim, *res judicata* provided an alternative ground for dismissal insofar as Ford's claims concern the same nucleus of operative facts as alleged in her 2012 complaint that the court had previously dismissed with prejudice. The court also denied Ford's motion to recuse the district court judge and dismissed as moot Ford's Motion for Intervention of the United States Attorney General.

“Although we liberally construe *pro se* briefs, such litigants must still brief the issues and reasonably comply with the standards of [Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure] 28 in order to preserve them.” *Davison v. Huntington Ingalls, Inc.*, 712 F.3d 884, 885 (5th Cir. 2013) (quoting *Clark v. Waters*, 407 F. App'x 794, 796 (5th Cir. 2011) (per curiam)). Rule 28 provides, among other things, that the appellant's brief must include “a concise statement of the case setting out the facts relevant to the issues submitted for review . . . with appropriate references to the record.” Fed. R. App. P. 28(a)(6). It also requires that the brief's argument contain the “appellant's contentions and the reasons for them, with citations to the authorities and parts of the record on which the appellant relies.” Fed. R. App. P. 28(a)(8)(A). Non-compliance with Rule 28 justifies dismissal when it is “so ‘fundamental’ that it prevents the court from engaging in meaningful review.” *Davison*, 712 F.3d at 885 (quoting *Owens v. Sec'y of Army*, 354 F. App'x 156, 158 (5th Cir. 2009) (per curiam)).

Even when we construe Ford's brief liberally, we conclude that she does not adequately address the district court's reasoning for dismissing her claim or denying her other motions and does not describe how she is entitled to any relief. Further, Ford's brief neither cites to the record nor does it adequately explain the relevance of the case law she references. Accordingly, we DISMISS the appeal for want of prosecution and DENY all pending motions.