

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

In the
United States Court of Appeals
For the Eleventh Circuit

No. 23-12350

Non-Argument Calendar

SYED IBRAHIM HUSSAIN,
SYED MUHAMMAD BAQIR HUSSAIN,
SYEDA SARA HUSSAIN,
BRIAN GUEX,
ROSELENE GUEX,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

versus

H. JAMES STADELMAN,
INTERVAL TITLE SERVICES, INC.,
JONATHAN BLOOM,
KHALID MUNEER,
JUPITER PROPERTIES, INC., et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Middle District of Florida
D.C. Docket No. 6:22-cv-01886-CEM-LHP

Before BRANCH, TJOFLAT and ANDERSON Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Syed Ibrahim Hussain, Syed Muhammed Baqir Hussain, and Syeda Sara Hussain, proceeding pro se, appeal the District Court’s dismissal of their first amended complaint with prejudice as an impermissible shotgun pleading and the District Court’s denial of Sara Hussain’s motion for reconsideration.

We affirm the dismissal of the Hussains’ amended complaint for the reasons stated in Parts II–III of the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation, as set out in *Hussain v. Stadelman*, No. 6:22-CV-1886, 2023 WL 4452372 (M.D. Fla. May 30, 2023). We affirm the denial of Sara Hussain’s motion for reconsideration because she did not present any new evidence or manifest errors of law or fact in her motion. *See Arthur v. King*, 500 F.3d 1335, 1343 (11th Cir. 2007) (per curiam) (“The only grounds for granting a Rule 59 motion are newly-discovered evidence or manifest errors of law or fact.” (citation modified)).

AFFIRMED.