[DO NOT PUBLISH]

In the

United States Court of Appeals

For the Eleventh Circuit

No. 24-12824

Non-Argument Calendar

CORNELIUS DAVIS,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

SOUTHEAST QSR LLC,

Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Florida
D.C. Docket No. 3:23-cv-00930-TKW-HTC

Before NEWSOM, GRANT, and ABUDU, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Cornelius Davis, proceeding *pro se*, appeals an order of the district court granting summary judgment to his former employer, Southeast QSR LLC. After careful review, we affirm.

We review the grant of summary judgment *de novo*, construing the facts and all reasonable inferences that can be drawn from the facts in the light most favorable to the non-moving party. *Guevara v. Lafise Corp.*, 127 F.4th 824, 828 (11th Cir. 2025). Recognizing that it is difficult to proceed *pro se*, we construe *pro se* pleadings and briefs liberally. *See Wright v. Newsome*, 795 F.2d 964, 967 (11th Cir. 1986); *Campbell v. Air Jam. Ltd.*, 760 F.3d 1165, 1168 (11th Cir. 2014). However, we will not "serve as *de facto* counsel for a party [or] rewrite an otherwise deficient pleading in order to sustain an action." *Campbell*, 760 F.3d at 1168–69. In addition, all parties, whether counseled or *pro se*, must comply with procedural rules. *See Albra v. Advan, Inc.*, 490 F.3d 826, 829 (11th Cir. 2007).

One of these procedural rules is the requirement that an appellant adequately brief the issues they would like us to review. *See* FED. R. APP. P. 28(a). When a party fails to properly brief an issue, we consider that issue abandoned. *Timson v. Sampson*, 518 F.3d 870, 874 (11th Cir. 2008). In order to properly brief an issue, a party must "plainly and prominently" raise it and cannot merely "make[] only passing references to it or raise[] it in a perfunctory manner without supporting arguments and authority." *Sapuppo v. Allstate Floridian Ins. Co.*, 739 F.3d 678, 681 (11th Cir. 2014) (quotation and

citation omitted). While we may consider abandoned issues in certain extraordinary circumstances, we do not often do so. *United States v. Campbell*, 26 F.4th 860, 873 (11th Cir. 2022) (*en banc*).[1]

Here, even after liberally construing Davis's brief, we conclude that it does not preserve any issues for our review.[2] The brief only cursorily discusses the proceedings below and expresses dissatisfaction with them. Davis does not develop any challenge to the district court's view of the facts, as detailed by the court's orders, nor does he contest the district court's application of the relevant law. He also does not cite any law or fact which he believes entitled him to a different outcome. Under our caselaw, the failure to develop any argument about the district court's rulings amounts to abandonment of any challenge to them. *Timson*, 518 F.3d at 874. In addition, the record does not present any of the narrow circumstances that would justify our review of an issue that Davis has abandoned. *See Campbell*, 26 F.4th at 873. As a result, we affirm.

AFFIRMED.

---

[1] Specifically, those circumstances include where: "(1) the issue involves a pure question of law and refusal to consider it would result in a miscarriage of justice; (2) the party lacked an opportunity to raise the issue at the district court level; (3) the interest of substantial justice is at stake; (4) the proper resolution is beyond any doubt; or (5) the issue presents significant questions of general impact or of great public concern." *Campbell*, 26 F.4th at 873.

[2] Davis arguably challenges a discovery ruling by the magistrate judge and bias on the part of the district court. However, he does not provide any detail about what he believes should have happened on these issues. We also find no error apparent in the record in these respects.