[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT
_____

No. 16-15727
Non-Argument Calendar
_____

D.C. Docket No. 7:14-cv-02144-RDP-TMP

CARLOS PERDUE,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

BIBB COUNTY CORRECTIONAL FACILITY HEALTH CARE UNIT,

Defendant,

CORIZON HEALTH CARE COMPANY,
CLABO,
KIRK,
HOOKS,
Doctor, Optometrist,

Defendants-Appellees.

_____

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Alabama
_____

(April 5, 2018)

Before JULIE CARNES, ANDERSON, and HULL, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Carlos Perdue, an Alabama prisoner proceeding *pro se*, appeals the district court's grant of summary judgment in favor of defendants Corizon Health Care Company, Dr. Michael Hooks, Nurse Patsy Clabo, and Nurse Sharon Kirk in his action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging violations of the Eighth Amendment.

We review *de novo* a district court's grant of summary judgment. *Smith v. LePage*, 834 F.3d 1285, 1291 (11th Cir. 2016). Although we construe *pro se* briefs liberally, we deem abandoned issues not briefed on appeal. *Timson v. Sampson*, 518 F.3d 870, 874 (11th Cir. 2008). We will not address arguments raised for the first time in the reply brief. *Id*.

Purdue's opening brief does not address the district court's decision to grant summary judgment in favor of the defendants, and he has, therefore, abandoned his argument that this decision was error. *See Timson*, 518 F.3d at 874. To the extent that Perdue's discussion of his claims in his reply brief can be construed as an argument that summary judgment was improper, we will not address an argument raised for the first time in a reply brief. *See id.*

Moreover, even if Perdue's abandonment were excused, our *de novo* review of the summary judgment record indicates that summary judgment was correctly granted below. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment.

AFFIRMED.