

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-12298
Non-Argument Calendar

D.C. Docket No. 1:12-cv-01776-CAP

BARBARA J. LATTIMORE,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

BANK OF AMERICA HOME LOANS,

Defendant,

BANK OF AMERICA, N.A.,

Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Georgia

(January 6, 2015)

Before WILLIAM PRYOR, JORDAN, and BLACK, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Barbara Lattimore, proceeding *pro se*, appeals from the district court's order denying her post-judgment motions for reconsideration in her suit against Bank of America, N.A. for claims related to a foreclosure on her home mortgage. The district court, in a single order, denied both motions as untimely, and alternatively, on the merits.

On appeal, Ms. Lattimore does not contest the district court's finding that her post-judgment motions were untimely, nor does she dispute the district court's conclusion that her motions for reconsideration failed on the merits. While we construe "briefs filed by *pro se* litigants liberally, issues not briefed on appeal by a *pro se* litigant are deemed abandoned." *Timson v. Sampson*, 518 F.3d 870, 874 (11th Cir. 2008) (citations omitted). By failing to address the district court's rulings in her initial brief, Ms. Lattimore has abandoned any challenge to them on appeal.¹

Rather than address the district court's bases for denying her motions, Ms. Latimore makes numerous arguments regarding the merits of her underlying case and raises new claims against Bank of America. We have held that "except when

¹ Ms. Lattimore did not file a reply brief.

we invoke the ‘plain error doctrine,’ which rarely applies in civil cases, we do not consider arguments raised for the first time on appeal.” *Ledford v. Peebles*, 657 F.3d 1222, 1258 (11th Cir. 2011). Accordingly, we decline to address the issues Ms. Lattimore raises in her initial brief.

AFFIRMED.