

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

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

April 1, 2019

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

---

No. 18-10656  
Summary Calendar

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee

v.

GILBERTO GOMEZ,

Defendant-Appellant

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of Texas  
USDC No. 3:16-CR-119-2

---

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, ELROD, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Gilberto Gomez appeals pro se from the entry of a preliminary order of criminal forfeiture imposed following his conviction on various drug and gun charges. *See* 21 U.S.C. § 853. Specifically, Gomez challenges the forfeiture of a home located at 3907 Palacios Avenue in Dallas, Texas (the Palacios house). He argues that this home had been left to him by his mother and that it does not represent the proceeds of any illegal activity. *See* § 853(a)(1).

---

\* 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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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. 18-10656

However, the Government's theory, which the district court adopted, was that the Palacios house was subject to forfeiture as property used to facilitate drug trafficking. *See* § 853(a)(2). Gomez's arguments on appeal regarding the origin of his ownership of the property do not address this conclusion, and our review of the record shows that there is extensive evidence to support it. While pro se briefs are afforded liberal construction, *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972), even pro se litigants must brief arguments to preserve them, *Yohey v. Collins*, 985 F.2d 222, 224-25 (5th Cir. 1993). Thus, Gomez has not shown the district court erred.

AFFIRMED.