

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

In the
United States Court of Appeals
For the Eleventh Circuit

No. 26-11375
Non-Argument Calendar

CARLOS DEROMANO,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

ALABAMA STATE BAR,
DISTRICT ATTORNEYS OF JEFFERSON COUNTY
BIRMINGHAM AND CLERKS,
MICHAEL THOMPSON,
LEROY MAXWELL,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Alabama
D.C. Docket No. 2:25-cv-01382-AMM

2

Opinion of the Court

26-11375

No. 26-11376
Non-Argument Calendar

CARLOS DEROMANO,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

ALABAMA JUDICIAL COMMISSION,

Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Alabama
D.C. Docket No. 2:25-cv-01379-AMM

Before ABUDU, KIDD, and ANDERSON, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

On August 20, 2025, Carlos DeRomano filed two separate pro se complaints in federal district court asserting that his constitutional rights had been violated in underlying state proceedings by the Alabama State Bar, the Alabama Judicial Commission, Jefferson County officials, and various individual attorneys and judges. Over DeRomano's objection, a magistrate judge consolidated these two cases.

Following DeRomano's response to a show-cause order, a district judge dismissed DeRomano's case with prejudice. In short,

26-11375

Opinion of the Court

3

the district judge concluded that DeRomano’s complaints “assert[ed] frivolous allegations that” had already been dismissed once for failure to state a claim for relief, and the new filings “[did] nothing to alleviate th[e] concerns” identified in the district court’s previous dismissal order. DeRomano 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 also 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”).

Even under the most liberal construction, DeRomano fails to challenge directly the district court’s core reason for dismissing his case—that his instant complaints appeared to be “identical” to those that had been previously dismissed for failure to state a claim. *See Timson v. Sampson*, 518 F.3d 870, 874 (11th Cir. 2008). The two appellate briefs DeRomano has filed make no reference to the district court’s dismissal order or supply any argument as to why the dismissal was erroneous, nor does he 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). Rather, DeRomano simply reasserts the factual allegations made in his complaints. While he alludes to the dismissal of previous federal

cases and states that “lower courts have erred in granting summary judgment to the State,” these passing statements are insufficient to preserve any challenge to the district court’s rulings in the instant case. *See id.*

We therefore conclude that DeRomano has forfeited any argument that the district court erred in entering its dismissal order. As such, we **AFFIRM** the dismissal of DeRomano’s case with prejudice.