

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 04-12801

D. C. Docket No. 03-00158 CV-AAA-2

FILED

**U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT**

May 18, 2005

**THOMAS K. KAHN
CLERK**

PAUL LIR ALEXANDER,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

HARPERCOLLINS PUBLISHERS, INC.,
BERNARD B. KERIK,

Defendants-Appellees.

NEWS CORPORATION,
K. RUPERT MURDOCK, et al.,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Georgia

(May 18, 2005)

Before EDMONDSON, Chief Judge, TJOFLAT and KRAVITCH, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Plaintiff-Appellant Alexander filed suit against Defendants-Appellees Kerik and HaperCollins alleging, among other things, invasion of privacy and negligence. The Southern District of Georgia granted summary judgment against Alexander. We affirm.¹

The district court also denied Alexander's motion to amend the judgment under Rule 59(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. We review denials of Rule 59(e) motions for an abuse of discretion. O'Neal v. Kennamer, 958 F.2d 1044, 1047 (11th Cir. 1992). We acknowledge that Alexander's counsel appeared only shortly before Defendants-Appellees filed their motion for summary judgment. But, Alexander's counsel never requested the district court for more time to respond to the motions. Accordingly, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion in denying the Rule 59(e) motion.

In all matters before this Court, therefore, the district court is affirmed.

AFFIRMED.

¹The district court decided that the First Amendment shielded Kerik and HarperCollins from liability.