



**COURT OF APPEALS
SECOND DISTRICT OF TEXAS
FORT WORTH**

NO. 02-11-00355-CV

ANTHONY BRANCH AND ALL
OCCUPANTS

APPELLANTS

V.

FANNIE MAE A/K/A FEDERAL
NATIONAL MORTGAGE
ASSOCIATION

APPELLEE

FROM COUNTY COURT AT LAW NO. 1 OF TARRANT COUNTY

MEMORANDUM OPINION¹

On June 1, 2012, we notified Appellant Anthony Branch that his brief did not comply with appellate rules of procedure 9.4(h) and 38.1(d), (f), (i), and (k) and local rule 1.A(8).² We allowed Appellant until June 11, 2012, to file an amended brief that

¹See Tex. R. App. P. 47.4.

²See Tex. R. App. P. 38.1(d), (f), (i), (k); 2nd Tex. App. (Fort Worth) Loc. R. 1.A(8).

complied with the above rules. We stated in our letter to Appellant that his failure to timely file an amended brief in compliance with the above rules could result in the waiver of noncompliant points, our striking his brief, or the dismissal of his appeal.³ We received Appellant's amended brief on June 11, 2012, but it too was noncompliant⁴ and therefore not filed by this court.

We liberally construe pro se briefs, but to ensure fairness in our treatment of all litigants, we hold pro se litigants to the same standards as licensed attorneys and require pro se litigants to follow the applicable laws and rules of procedure.⁵ Accordingly, we strike Appellant's brief, deny his request to supplement his original brief, and dismiss this appeal for want of prosecution.⁶

PER CURIAM

PANEL: DAUPHINOT, GARDNER, and WALKER, JJ.

DELIVERED: July 26, 2012

³See Tex. R. App. P. 38.8(a), 38.9(a), 42.3(b), (c).

⁴See Tex. R. App. P. 38.1(d), (i), (k).

⁵See *Mansfield State Bank v. Cohn*, 573 S.W.2d 181, 184–85 (Tex. 1978); *Shull v. United Parcel Serv.*, 4 S.W.3d 46, 53 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1999, pet. denied), *cert. denied*, 531 U.S. 835 (2000).

⁶See Tex. R. App. P. 38.8(a), 38.9(a), 42.3(b), (c).