

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 15-11052  
Non-Argument Calendar

---

D.C. Docket No. 8:14-cv-01064-VMC-TBM

HANS KAISER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

SCOTT STEELE,  
Pinellas County Detective,  
TWO UNKNOWN FEMALE OFFICERS,  
Sexual Predator and Offender Tracking Unit ("S.P.O.T."),  
Pinellas County Sheriff's Office,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

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

---

(April 4, 2016)

Before HULL, MARCUS, and WILSON, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Hans Kaiser, a prisoner proceeding pro se, appeals the sua sponte dismissal of his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action for violations of the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments.

Rule 28(a) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure requires that an appellant's brief contain a statement of the issues presented for review and the appellant's contentions concerning those issues. Fed. R. App. P. 28(a)(5), (a)(8). Although we liberally construe pro se briefs, arguments not raised on appeal—even by pro se litigants—are “deemed abandoned.” *See Timson v. Sampson*, 518 F.3d 870, 874 (11th Cir. 2008) (per curiam).

In this case, the district court dismissed Kaiser's action as time-barred, which Kaiser fails to address in his brief. Indeed, on appeal, Kaiser does not mention the statute of limitations, and we will not act as his “*de facto* counsel” in order to preserve the issue. *See Campbell v. Air Jamaica Ltd.*, 760 F.3d 1165, 1168–69 (11th Cir. 2014), *cert. denied*, 135 S. Ct. 759 (2014). Therefore, Kaiser has abandoned any argument that his claim is not time-barred. *See Timson*, 518 F.3d at 874. Accordingly, upon review of the record and consideration of Kaiser's brief, we affirm the district court's dismissal.

**AFFIRMED.**