

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

In the  
United States Court of Appeals  
For the Eleventh Circuit

---

No. 25-12972  
Non-Argument Calendar

---

REGINALD WILLIAMS,

*Plaintiff-Appellant,*

*versus*

HONDA PLANT,

Line 1,

*Defendant-Appellee.*

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of Alabama  
D.C. Docket No. 1:25-cv-01091-RDP

---

Before LUCK, LAGOA, and KIDD, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

In July 2025, Reginald Williams filed a pro se age discrimination suit against the Honda Manufacturing Plant in Lincoln, Alabama, along with a motion to proceed in forma pauperis. The district court soon thereafter instructed Williams to amend his complaint because his initial allegations were difficult to decipher. Williams timely complied, but the court ultimately dismissed his amended complaint without prejudice under 18 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). It found that the amended complaint failed to sufficiently provide notice to Honda and the court of Williams’s intended claims or what facts he believed plausibly entitled him to relief. Williams now appeals.

While we hold the filings of pro se litigants to a “less stringent” standard than those drafted by lawyers, we may not act as a party’s de facto counsel or “rewrite an otherwise deficient pleading in order to sustain an action.” *Campbell v. Air Jam. Ltd.*, 760 F.3d 1165, 1168–69 (11th Cir. 2014) (citation modified); see *Moon v. Newsome*, 863 F.2d 835, 837 (11th Cir. 1989) (noting that pro se litigants are still “subject to the relevant law and rules of court”).

The Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure require that an appellant’s brief contain the following relevant information: (1) a jurisdictional statement; (2) a statement of the issues for review; (3) a concise statement of the case setting out the relevant facts, describing the relevant procedural history, and identifying the rulings presented for review, with appropriate references to the rec-

25-12972

Opinion of the Court

3

ord; and (4) an argument section containing the appellant's contentions, with citations to authority and the record. Fed. R. App. P. 28(a)(4)–(6), (8)(A).

For his brief on appeal, Williams appears to have used a sample form but largely fails to replace the document's instructional language with his own. Although the brief includes section headings dedicated to jurisdiction, a statement of the issues, a statement of the case, and argument, these sections do not include language particular to Williams's case, as required by Rule 28.

Nonetheless, even assuming his brief satisfies Rule 28 and affording his arguments the most liberal construction, Williams fails to challenge directly the district court's core reason for dismissing his case—his failure to plausibly allege a claim for relief. See *Timson v. Sampson*, 518 F.3d 870, 874 (11th Cir. 2008). Williams's brief makes no reference to the district court's dismissal of his amended complaint or supply any argument as to why the dismissal was erroneous, nor does Williams cite any authority that could support such a contention. See *Sapuppo v. Allstate Floridian Ins. Co.*, 739 F.3d 678, 681–82 (11th Cir. 2014) (explaining that an appellant abandons any argument not briefed on appeal, made in passing, or raised briefly without supporting arguments or authority). While he passingly references the unfair treatment he received from Honda, these brief statements are insufficient to preserve any challenge to the district court's rulings. See *id.*

We therefore conclude that Williams has forfeited any argument that the district court erred in dismissing his amended complaint for failure to state a claim for relief. As such, we **AFFIRM** the district court's dismissal order.