[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 18-14572
Non-Argument Calendar

D.C. Docket No. 2:18-cv-00135-MHT-GMB

LAWRENCE WELLS,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

GOURMET SERVICES INC.,
AL BAKER,
VP Operation,
GIL JONES,
President,
TIA BENTON,
HR,
CHARLES JONES,
District Manager, et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

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

(October 3, 2019)

Before WILSON, NEWSOM, and HULL, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Lawrence Wells, proceeding *pro se*, appeals the district court's dismissal of his employment discrimination suit under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e-2, 2000e-3, as barred by *res judicata*. On appeal, though, Wells does not address whether *res judicata* bars his complaint. Accordingly, we find ourselves constrained to hold that he has abandoned any challenge to the district court's decision. We affirm.

The parties are familiar with the litigation history of this case, and therefore the facts and proceedings are summarized only insofar as necessary to explain the context of our decision. In short, Wells alleged that he was fired from his job with Gourmet Services in retaliation for submitting complaints to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Following Gourmet Services's motion to dismiss, the district court adopted the magistrate judge's recommendation that Wells's claims be dismissed as precluded by a prior lawsuit between the parties, which stemmed from the same facts.

Wells does not argue on appeal that the district court erred in dismissing his complaint as barred by *res judicata*. Instead, his brief addresses the merits of whether Wells was discharged in retaliation for engaging in statutorily protected activity under Title VII. If an appellant does not address "one of the grounds on

which the district court based its judgment, he is deemed to have abandoned any challenge of that ground," and thus, "the judgment is due to be affirmed." *Sapuppo v. Allstate Floridian Ins. Co.*, 739 F.3d 678, 680 (11th Cir. 2014) (citation omitted).

We liberally construe pro se briefs. *Timson v. Sampson*, 518 F.3d 870, 874 (11th Cir. 2008). Even so, we will not make arguments for the parties, and issues not briefed are therefore deemed abandoned. *See id.* The Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure require an appellant's argument to contain "contentions and the reasons for them, with citations to the authorities and parts of the record on which the appellant relies." Fed. R. App. P. 28(a)(8)(A). We have held that a claim is not adequately briefed if the party does not "plainly and prominently" raise it, "for instance by devoting a discrete section of his argument to those claims." *Sapuppo*, 739 F.3d at 681 (citation omitted).

Here, Wells has abandoned any argument that he theoretically could have made on appeal in regard to the district court's dismissal of his complaint as barred by *res judicata*. Although Wells is *pro se*, no construction of his brief on appeal can deduce an argument that the district court erred in dismissing his complaint as barred by *res judicata*. Therefore, because we cannot make arguments for the parties, and because Wells has not addressed the reason for the district court's

dismissal of his complaint, he has abandoned any argument to the contrary.
Accordingly, we affirm.

AFFIRMED.