

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

In the  
United States Court of Appeals  
For the Eleventh Circuit

---

No. 25-10536  
Non-Argument Calendar

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*Plaintiff-Appellee,*

*versus*

GREGORY CHANDLER, JR.,

*Defendant-Appellant.*

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Southern District of Florida  
D.C. Docket No. 1:20-cr-20154-JEM-1

---

Before JORDAN, LUCK, and TJOFLAT, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Gregory Chandler, Jr., a federal prisoner proceeding pro se, appeals the District Court's paperless order denying his motions requesting copies of certain docket entries and trial exhibits. The Government moves for summary affirmance, arguing that the appeal is frivolous. We grant the Government's motion.

I.

The District Court, in a paperless order, denied three of Chandler's motions: (1) a motion for a copy of all case documents, (2) a notice of deficiencies and request for corrected documents, and (3) a motion for copies of thirteen docket entries. Chandler appealed, stating in his brief that he was appealing "only two parts" of the order: the denial of his motion for a copy of Exhibit 21 and the denial of his motion for a copy of all case documents. The brief then does not address his motion for a copy of all case documents; it solely addresses his motion for a copy of Exhibit 21.<sup>1</sup> However, the paperless order Chandler is appealing did not rule on his motion for a copy of Exhibit 21; that motion is still pending before the District Court.

II.

Summary disposition is appropriate where "the position of one of the parties is clearly right as a matter of law so that there can be no substantial question as to the outcome of the case, or

---

<sup>1</sup> We DENY Chandler's motion to file an out of time response to the Government's motion for summary affirmance.

25-10536

Opinion of the Court

3

where, as is more frequently the case, the appeal is frivolous.” *Groendyke Transp., Inc. v. Davis*, 406 F.2d 1158, 1162 (5th Cir. 1969). An appeal is frivolous where the party is not entitled to relief because there is no basis in fact or law to support the party’s position. *See Bilal v. Driver*, 251 F.3d 1346, 1349 (11th Cir. 2001) (“A claim is frivolous if it is without arguable merit either in law or fact.”). Moreover, “issues not briefed on appeal by a pro se litigant are deemed abandoned.” *Timson v. Sampson*, 518 F.3d 870, 874 (11th Cir. 2008).

Here, Chandler’s appeal is frivolous. It solely addresses Chandler’s motion for a copy of Exhibit 21, which was not ruled on in the paperless order and, therefore, is not properly before this Court. And Chandler has waived arguments related to the three motions that were decided by the paperless order by not briefing them. Accordingly, we GRANT the Government’s motion for summary affirmance.

### III.

The Government’s motion for summary affirmance is granted.

**GRANTED.**

**AFFIRMED.**