

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 06-10565  
Non-Argument Calendar

---

|   |
|---|
| FILED<br>U.S. COURT OF APPEALS<br>ELEVENTH CIRCUIT<br>OCTOBER 31, 2006<br>THOMAS K. KAHN<br>CLERK |
|---|

D. C. Docket No. 03-01065-CV-J-12-TEM

MS LIFE INSURANCE CO.,

Plaintiff-Counter-  
Defendant-Appellee,

versus

DONNA J. BARFIELD,

Defendant-Counter-  
Claimant-Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Middle District of Florida

---

**(October 31, 2006)**

Before DUBINA, BLACK and MARCUS, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

In her notice of appeal, appellant Donna Barfield (“Barfield”) appeals the district court’s grant of summary judgment in favor of MS Life Insurance Company (“MS”), and third party-defendant Buddy Hutchinson, Inc., and that portion of the district court’s order which denied Barfield’s motion for continuance and for leave to amend.

We first observe, after reading Barfield’s amended initial brief, that she fails to address the district court’s grant of summary judgment in favor of MS. Issues not argued on appeal are deemed waived. *See United States v. Curtis*, 380 F.3d 1308, 1310 (11th Cir. 2004) (discussing long-standing rule in this circuit that issues not raised in a party’s initial brief on appeal are deemed waived), *cert. denied*, 126 S. Ct. 418 (2005).

We review a district court’s denial of trial continuances for abuse of discretion. *United States v. Bowe*, 221 F.3d 1183, 1189 (11th Cir. 2000). We also review a district court’s denial of a motion for leave to amend a complaint for an abuse of discretion. *Carruthers v. BSA Advertising, Inc.*, 357 F.3d 1213, 1217-18 (11th Cir. 2004).

Assuming we have jurisdiction over the district court’s order filed on October 18, 2005, which denied Barfield’s motion to continue and motion for

leave to amend, we affirm that order because we conclude from the record that the district court did not abuse its discretion in its rulings.

**AFFIRMED.**