

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

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

March 28, 2018

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

No. 16-41081
Summary Calendar

SHAWN L. DUNN,

Plaintiff-Appellant

v.

JEFFREY CATOE, Warden; STUART CALHOUN, Assistant Warden; JOHN BECRAFT, Law Library Supervisor; CHRISTI HOISINGTON, Unit Grievance Investigator; AKBAR SHABAZZ, Muslim Chaplain,

Defendants-Appellees

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Texas
USDC No. 6:15-CV-737

Before REAVLEY, PRADO, and GRAVES, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Shawn L. Dunn, Texas prisoner # 1686724, filed a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint, in which he alleged that he was denied freedom of religion, he was denied the right to access the courts, and his prison grievances were mishandled. The district court dismissed Dunn's § 1983 claims, in part, and granted summary judgment in favor of defendant John Becraft on Dunn's

* 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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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. 16-41081

denial of access to the courts claim. The district court also denied Dunn's motion for the appointment of counsel. Dunn fails to present legal argument that addresses the district court's rulings.

Although this court applies less stringent standards to parties proceeding pro se than to parties represented by counsel, and liberally construes briefs of pro se litigants, pro se parties must still brief the issues and reasonably comply with the requirements of FED. R. APP. P. 28. *Grant v. Cuellar*, 59 F.3d 523, 524 (5th Cir. 1995). The appellant's brief must contain an argument, with his "contentions and the reasons for them, with citations to the authorities and parts of the record on which the appellant relies" and "for each issue, a concise statement of the applicable standard of review." FED. R. APP. P. 28(a)(8)(A)-(B); *see Yohey v. Collins*, 985 F.2d 222, 225 (5th Cir. 1993). General arguments that give only broad standards of review, without citing to specific errors, are insufficient to preserve issues for appeal. *Brinkmann v. Dallas County Deputy Sheriff Abner*, 813 F.2d 744, 748 (5th Cir. 1987).

As Dunn fails to present argument that sufficiently challenges the district court's rulings, he has abandoned any such challenge. *See Grant*, 59 F.3d at 524; *Yohey*, 985 F.2d at 225. This appeal is frivolous and is therefore DISMISSED. *See Howard v. King*, 707 F.2d 215, 220 (5th Cir. 1983); 5TH CIR. R. 42.2. The dismissal of this appeal counts as a strike for purposes of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). *See Coleman v. Tollefson*, 135 S. Ct. 1759, 1761-63 (2015); *Adepegba v. Hammons*, 103 F.3d 383, 387-88 (5th Cir. 1996). Dunn is WARNED that if he accumulates three strikes, he may not proceed in forma pauperis in any civil action or appeal filed while he is incarcerated or detained in any facility unless he is under imminent danger of serious physical injury. *See* § 1915(g).