

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 06-16489  
Non-Argument Calendar

---

FILED U.S. COURT OF APPEALS ELEVENTH CIRCUIT JUNE 13 2007 THOMAS K. KAHN CLERK
---

D. C. Docket No. 97-00011-CR-1-MP

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

EDWARD LAMONA JOHNSON, JR.,

Defendant-Appellant.

---

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

---

**(June 13, 2007)**

Before TJOFLAT, BARKETT and HULL, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Edward Lamona Johnson, Jr., proceeding pro se, appeals the district court's

denial of his motion to dismiss count one of the indictment pursuant to Fed.R.Crim.P. 33, which he styled as a motion to dismiss count one of the indictment under Rule 33. A jury found Johnson guilty in 1997, and he filed the motion on October 13, 2006. The district court denied Johnson's motion to dismiss count one of the indictment, finding that his motion was not filed within three years of the verdict in his case, as required by Fed.R.Crim.P. 33(b)(1).

Although Pro se pleadings are held to a less stringent standard than pleadings drafted by attorneys and will, therefore, be liberally construed, Tannenbaum v. United States, 148 F.3d 1262, 1263 (11th Cir. 1998), when an appellant fails to raise an argument in his initial brief, that issue is abandoned. United States v. Thomas, 242 F.3d 1028, 1033 (11th Cir. 2001). Here, although we must construe Johnson's brief liberally, he fails to challenge in any way the district court's conclusion that his motion was untimely under Fed.R.Crim.P. 33(b)(1). Timeliness is the only issue the district court decided, and Johnson abandons any argument related to that issue. Accordingly the decision of the district court is

AFFIRMED.