

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 00-11360  
Conference Calendar

---

JAMES D. BOSWELL, Individually and on  
behalf of all others similarly situated;  
VANESSA LACE BOSWELL, Individually and on  
behalf of all others similarly situated;  
SHAUNA MROSKI, Individually and on behalf of  
all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

versus

BOARD OF TRUSTEES TEXAS CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY,  
individual members (in their official capacities only);  
GEORGE BUSH, Governor, individual and official capacity;  
DANIEL JAMES, Major, Adjutant General of Texas;  
LOUIS CALDERA, Secretary of the Army, National Guard  
Bureau Agency,

Defendants-Appellees.

-----  
Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of Texas  
USDC No. 4:00-CV-1526-Y  
-----

June 13, 2001

Before WIENER, DeMOSS, and DENNIS, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

James D. Boswell, Vanessa Boswell, and Shauna Mroski  
("Appellants") appeal the dismissal of their civil complaint. We  
review *de novo* a dismissal based on *res judicata*. *Schmueser v.*  
*Burkburnett Bank*, 937 F.2d 1025, 1031 (5th Cir. 1991).

---

\* 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that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent  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.

Although we afford a liberal construction to *pro se* filings, *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972), *pro se* appellants are required to 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); *Yohey v. Collins*, 985 F.2d 222, 225 (5th Cir. 1993). When an appellant does not identify error in the district court's analysis, it is as if the appellant had not appealed the judgment. *Brinkmann v. Dallas County Deputy Sheriff Abner*, 813 F.2d 744, 748 (5th Cir. 1987).

Because the Appellants do not argue that it was error for the district court to have used *res judicata* as a basis for dismissing their complaint, the issue is deemed abandoned by them. *Brinkmann*, 813 F.2d at 748. We do not consider the Appellants' argument raised for the first time in their reply brief. See *Cinel v. Connick*, 15 F.3d 1338, 1345 (5th Cir. 1994 (scope of reply brief is limited, and appellant abandons all issues not raised and argued in initial brief on appeal)); *Knighten v. Commissioner*, 702 F.2d 59, 60 & n.1 (5th Cir. 1983) (issue may not be raised for first time in reply brief, even by a *pro se* appellant). The judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.