

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

In the
United States Court of Appeals
For the Eleventh Circuit

No. 21-11273

Non-Argument Calendar

JEFFREY LANCE HILL, SR.,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

LEANDRA G. JOHNSON,
individually,
GREGORY S. PARKER,
individually,
JENNIFER B. SPRINGFIELD,
individually,
WILLIAM F. WILLIAMS, III,
individually,
JOEL F. FOREMAN,

2

Opinion of the Court

21-11273

individually, et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Middle District of Florida
D.C. Docket No. 3:17-cv-01342-HLA-JRK

Before JORDAN, NEWSOM, and BRANCH, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

In 2017, Jeffrey Hill filed a *pro se* civil rights complaint against, among others, the Suwannee River Water Management District (SRWMD). That complaint was dismissed for failure to state a claim, and we affirmed on appeal. *Hill v. Johnson*, 787 F. App'x 604, 606–07 (11th Cir. 2019). Thereafter, SRWMD filed a motion for attorney's fees and costs. Hill did not file a response, and the district court granted the motion in part, awarding SRWMD \$8,924.00 in attorney's fees and \$245.87 in costs. Hill then filed a motion for reconsideration, which was denied.

Hill, proceeding *pro se*, now appeals from the order denying his motion for reconsideration. However, Hill fails to raise any

21-11273

Opinion of the Court

3

argument related to the denial of his motion for reconsideration.¹ Instead, he quarrels with the previous dismissal of his complaint and our decision affirming that dismissal, and the district court's decision to award attorney's fees and costs, and he argues that certain aspects of the Florida state court judgments against him are improper. None of those issues are before us. Accordingly, Hill has abandoned any challenge to the denial of the motion for reconsideration. *Timson v. Sampson*, 518 F.3d 870, 874 (11th Cir. 2008) ("While we read briefs filed by *pro se* litigants liberally, issues not briefed on appeal by a *pro se* litigant are deemed abandoned." (internal citation omitted)).

AFFIRMED.

¹ Previously, we dismissed as untimely the portion of Hill's appeal that sought to appeal the district court's order awarding attorney's fees and costs to SRWMD. Thus, the only order before us is the district court's order denying Hill's motion for reconsideration.