

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 19-14494; 19-14690; 20-10860
Non-Argument Calendar

D.C. Docket No. 1:18-cv-00273-SCJ

MARSHALL T. BAILEY,
SHIRLEY P. BAILEY,
MATTHEW R. BAILEY,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

versus

DEUTSCHE BANK NATIONAL TRUST COMPANY, AS TRUSTEE,
OCWEN LOAN SERVICING, LLC,
DEUTSCHE BANK,
as Trustee for GSAA Home Equity Trust 2006-18,
Asset-Backed Certificates, Series 2006-18,

Defendants-Appellees,

D.C. Docket 1:18-cv-00274-SCJ

MATTHEW R. BAILEY,
MARSHALL T. BAILEY,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

versus

DEUTSCHE BANK,
as Trustee for GSAA Home Equity Trust 2006-18,
Asset-Backed Certificates, Series 2006-18,
OCWEN LOAN SERVICING, LLC,
DEUTSCHE BANK NATIONAL TRUST COMPANY, AS TRUSTEE,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Georgia

(July 27, 2021)

Before WILLIAM PRYOR, Chief Judge, LAGOA and BRASHER, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

In this consolidated appeal, Shirley, Marshall, and Matthew Bailey appeal *pro se* the denial of their motions to reconsider the dismissal of their complaints

against Deutsche Bank and Ocwen Loan Servicing, LLC. The district court ruled that the Baileys' motions were untimely, Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e), identified no newly discovered evidence or manifest errors of law or fact, *see Arthur v. King*, 500 F.3d 1335, 1343 (11th Cir. 2007), and failed to "demonstrate a justification for relief so compelling that the district court was required to grant [the] motion" as required to obtain relief under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b), *Rice v. Ford Motor Co.*, 88 F.3d 914, 919 (11th Cir. 1996). "[W]e read briefs filed by *pro se* litigants liberally," but because the Baileys do not dispute that their motions were defective and their brief lacks citations to the record or authority, Fed. R. App. P. 28(a)(8)(A), we deem abandoned any argument they could have made challenging the denial of their motions. *See Timson v. Sampson*, 518 F.3d 870, 874 (11th Cir. 2008). The Baileys argue, for the first time, about corruption and bias by a magistrate judge and the district court, but "[t]his Court has repeatedly held that an issue not raised in the district court and raised for the first time in an appeal will not be considered by this court." *Access Now, Inc. v. Sw. Airlines Co.*, 385 F.3d 1324, 1331 (11th Cir. 2004) (internal quotation marks omitted). We affirm the denial of the Baileys' motions to reconsider.

AFFIRMED.