

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 00-50662
Conference Calendar

CHARLES T. HOOG,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

FRIO COUNTY, In Its Municipal Capacity; FRIO COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT, In Its Municipal Capacity; MEDINA COUNTY, In Its Municipal Capacity; MEDINA COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT, In Its Municipal Capacity; DONNY R WHITAKER, In His Official and Individual Capacity; RANDY BROWN, MR., In His Official and Individual Capacity; WESLEY SCOTT, In His Official and Individual Capacity; STEPHEN YARBROUGH, DVM, In His Official and Individual Capacities; JAMES SINDON, In His Official and Individual Capacities; SHANNA JO STRONG, In Her Official and Individual Capacities; CARLOS GARCIA, In His Official and Individual Capacities; CARL BURRS, In His Official and Individual Capacities; J. R. GULLEY, JR., In His Official and Individual Capacities; JERRY REYENA, In His Official and Individual Capacities; JOHN WALDRUM, In His Official and Individual Capacities; CLARK SAKLER, In His Official and Individual Capacities; PHILLIP WILLIAMS, In His Official and Individual Capacities; KEYSTONE FEED YARD, In Its Corporate Capacity; MARVIN E. RHODE, SR., In His Official and Individual Capacities; JAMES W. SMITH, In His Official and Individual Capacities; ROBERT MCGOWEN, In His Corporate and Individual Capacity; MCGOWEN LAW OFFICES, INC., In Its Corporate Capacity; ROBERT L. BARROWS, In His Corporate and Individual Capacities; LELAUREN & ADAMS, PC, In Its Corporate Capacity; JAMES BIAS, In His Corporate and Individual Capacities; HUMANE SOCIETY OF BEXAR COUNTY -SPCA, In Its Corporate Capacity; FOX CHANNEL 29, In Its Corporate Capacity; SAN ANTONIO EXPRESS NEWS, In Its Corporate Capacity; CASTROVILLE-LA COSTE NEW BULLETIN, In Its Corporate Capacity; MEDINA VALLEY TIMES, In Its Corporate Capacity; KATHLEEN BACHUS, In her Corporate and Individual Capacities; THOMAS CARLUCCI, In His Corporate and Individual Capacities; LISA SANDBERG, In Her Corporate and Individual Capacities; MARC ROBERTSON, In His Corporate and Individual Capacities; MANUEL AZOCAR, III, In His Corporate and Individual Capacities; EDWARD A. ORNELAS, In His Corporate and Individual Capacities; JERRY LARA, In His Corporate and Individual Capacities; CASTROVILLE STATE BANK, In His Corporate Capacity; JAMES TONDRE, In His Corporate and Individual Capacities; FRANK MOFFETT, DVM, In His Corporate and Individual Capacities; ROY TREVINO, In His Corporate and Individual

Capacities; JAY BARNUM, In His Corporate and Individual Capacities; MARJORIE KRAUSE, In Her Official and Individual Capacities; BEA BELOHLAVEK, In Her Official and Individual Capacities; DALLAS MORNING NEWS, INC., LP, In its Corporate Capacity; WILLIAM BLAGG, U.S. Attorney, In His Official Federal and Individual Capacities; MIKE BRADFORD, In His Official Federal and Individual Capacities; ANDREA PARKER, In Her Official Federal and Individual Capacities; ORLANDO L. GARCIA, Judge, In His Official and Individual Capacities; JOHN W. PRIMOMO, U.S. Magistrate Judge, In His Official and Individual Capacity; PAM MCGRAW, In Her Corporate and Individual Capacities; WILLIAM RHEA, In His Corporate and Individual Capacities; RICHARD SCHELL, In His Official and Individual Capacities; PAUL BROWN, In His Official and Individual Capacities; DAVID FOLSOM, In His Official and Individual Capacities; CAROLINE MALONE, In Her Official and Individual Capacities; DAVID MALAND, In His Official and Individual Capacities; JAMES WOODS, JR, In His Official and Individual Capacities; WILLIAM G. PUTNICKI, Clerk, In His Official and Individual Capacities; SANDRA SOUTHERLAND, In Her Official and Individual Capacities; TULL; A. H. BELLO CORPORATION, In Its Corporate Capacity; JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION, In Its Corporate Capacity; KURT HOWARD KUHN, In His Official and Individual Capacities; FRIO-NUECES CURRENT, In Its Corporate Capacity; KMOL-TV, CHANNEL 4, In its Corporate Capacity; KENS-TV CHANNEL 5, In Its Corporate Capacity; KSAT-TV, CHANNEL 12, In Its Corporate Capacity,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Texas
USDC No. SA-00-CV-640

April 10, 2001

Before JOLLY, HIGGINBOTHAM, and JONES, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Charles T. Hoog appeals from the dismissal of his complaint alleging violations of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act ("RICO"), 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961-1968, as well as various constitutional and state law claims. We review a

* 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.

dismissal for failure to state a claim de novo. See Cinel v. Connick, 15 F.3d 1338, 1341 (5th Cir. 1994). We conclude that the district court did not err.

Although this court liberally construes pro se briefs; see Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972); this court requires arguments to be briefed in order to be preserved. Yohey v. Collins, 985 F.2d 222, 225 (5th Cir. 1993). Claims not adequately argued in the body of the brief are deemed abandoned on appeal. Id. at 224-25. Hoog's brief merely repeats verbatim nearly his entire complaint. We conclude that Hoog has failed to adequately brief the majority of his claims, and we consider only his RICO claim. We conclude, however, that Hoog's complaint fails to sufficiently allege a pattern of racketeering activity connected to the acquisition, establishment, conduct, or control of an enterprise. See Word of Faith World Outreach Center Church, Inc. v. Sawyer, 90 F.3d 118, 122 (5th Cir. 1996); Manax v. McNamara, 842 F.2d 808, 811 (5th Cir. 1988).

We also conclude that Hoog's argument that the district judge should have been disqualified because of personal bias is without merit. See Matassarini v. Lynch, 174 F.3d 549, 571 (5th Cir. 1999), cert. denied, 528 U.S. 1116 (2000). Finally, the motion of appellee KMOL-TV for leave to file an out of time brief is GRANTED.

The instant appeal is entirely without merit and is therefore frivolous. As such, it is dismissed. 5th Cir. R. 42.2.

DISMISSED.