

**Dismissed and Memorandum Opinion filed April 18, 2017.**



**In The**

**Fourteenth Court of Appeals**

---

**NO. 14-16-00152-CV**

---

**SHEIKH M. RAFIQ, Appellant**

**V.**

**NUEVA VIDA APARTMENTS, Appellee**

---

**On Appeal from the County Civil Court at Law No. 3  
Harris County, Texas  
Trial Court Cause No. 1057438**

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Appellant, pro se, filed a brief that did not comply with the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure. The brief failed generally to comply with Rule 38. *See* Tex. R. App. P. 38.1(b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), and (i). Appellee filed a brief, arguing that appellant had waived any error due to inadequate briefing. *See, e.g., Fredonia State Bank v. Gen. Am. Life Ins. Co.*, 881 S.W.2d 279, 284 (Tex. 1994) (reaffirming that “error may be waived by inadequate briefing”).

We struck appellant's brief and ordered appellant to file a brief complying with Rule 38 by March 14, 2017. *See* Tex. R. App. P. 38.9. We informed appellant that if he filed another noncompliant brief or failed to file a brief, the appeal may be dismissed for want of prosecution. *See* Tex. R. App. P. 38.9(a), 38.8(a)(1).

On March 20, appellant filed a "response" that fails generally to comply with Rule 38. Appellant contends, "I WILL NOT WASTE MY TIME IN ANY RESPONSE and will focus, in collaboration with special U.S. Attorney, in Federal courts." [sic]

Pro se litigants like appellant are held to the same standards as licensed attorneys, and they must comply with all applicable rules of procedure. *See, e.g., Mansfield State Bank v. Cohn*, 573 S.W.2d 181, 184–85 (Tex. 1978); *Reule v. M & T Mortg.*, 483 S.W.3d 600, 608 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2015, pet. denied). Although we liberally construe briefs, appellant has not substantially complied with the briefing rules. *See Harkins v. Dever Nursing Home*, 999 S.W.2d 571, 573 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1999, no pet.) (citing Tex. R. App. 38.9)).

Because appellant has not filed an amended brief in compliance with Rule 38, we proceed as if appellant has failed to file a brief. *See* Tex. R. App. 38.9. Under these circumstances, we dismiss the appeal for want of prosecution. *See* Tex. R. App. 38.8(a)(1); *Harkins*, 999 S.W.2d at 573.

PER CURIAM

Panel consists of Justices Boyce, Busby, and Wise.