

**FILED**  
**United States Court of Appeals**  
**Tenth Circuit**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**  
**TENTH CIRCUIT**

**November 27, 2012**

**Elisabeth A. Shumaker**  
**Clerk of Court**

EVERETT HOUCK,

Plaintiff–Appellant,

v.

HAROLD BALL; JUDGE DAN  
OWENS,

Defendants–Appellees.

No. 12-6214  
(D.C. No. 5:12-CV-00840-HE)  
(W.D. Okla.)

---

**ORDER AND JUDGMENT\***

---

Before **LUCERO, O’BRIEN**, and **MATHESON**, Circuit Judges.

---

Everett Houck, proceeding pro se, appeals the dismissal of his complaint.

Exercising jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291, we affirm.

According to Houck’s complaint, Harold Ball required Houck to vacate his home

---

\* After examining appellant’s brief and the appellate record, this panel has determined unanimously that oral argument would not materially assist the determination of this appeal. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2) and 10th Cir. R. 34.1(G). The case is therefore ordered submitted without oral argument. This order and judgment is not binding precedent, except under the doctrines of law of the case, res judicata, and collateral estoppel. It may be cited, however, for its persuasive value consistent with Fed. R. App. P. 32.1 and 10th Cir. R. 32.1.

following a foreclosure in 2011. Houck filed a motion in Oklahoma state court seeking additional time to vacate, claiming that he was entitled to reasonable accommodations under the Fair Housing Act because of multiple ailments. Houck claims that Ball and Judge Dan Owens, a judge involved in his state lawsuit, violated the Fair Housing Act by denying him additional time to move. The district court dismissed Houck's suit, concluding that the complaint stated no cause of action against Ball under the Fair Housing Act and that Judge Owens was entitled to judicial immunity. This appeal timely followed.

Although we liberally construe pro se filings, Martinez v. Garden, 430 F.3d 1302, 1304 (10th Cir. 2005), we may not "assume the role of advocate" and make Houck's arguments for him, Yang v. Archuleta, 525 F.3d 925, 927 n.1 (10th Cir. 2008) (quotation omitted). Houck's brief on appeal asserts that the district court decided his case incorrectly, but does not develop any specific line of argument. Under Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 28(a)(9)(A), an appellant must provide an argument containing "appellant's contentions and the reasons for them, with citations to the authorities and parts of the record on which the appellant relies." Houck has failed to do so, and has thus waived any challenge to the district court's decision. See Harsco Corp. v. Renner, 475 F.3d 1179, 1190 (10th Cir. 2007) ("[A] party waives those arguments that its opening brief inadequately addresses.").

The judgment of the district court is **AFFIRMED**.

Entered for the Court

Carlos F. Lucero  
Circuit Judge