

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-10054
Non-Argument Calendar

FILED U.S. COURT OF APPEALS ELEVENTH CIRCUIT JULY 5, 2012 JOHN LEY CLERK

D. C. Docket No. 1:10-cv-01423-ODE

THOMAS K. BUSH,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT,
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA,
ATLANTA DIVISION
ALL U.S. DISTRICT COURT IN THE UNITED STATES,
and its territories, et al.

Defendants-Appellees.

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

(July 5, 2012)

Before EDMONDSON, HULL and BLACK, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Thomas Bush, proceeding pro se, appeals the district court's sua sponte

dismissal of his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint as frivolous: pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). No reversible error has been shown; we affirm.

Bush filed a section 1983 complaint against all federal and State of Georgia judges, all federal district and appellate courts, the United States Supreme Court, the judicial branches of both the United States and the State of Georgia, and the State of Georgia. He contended that defendants failed to protect him from the executive and legislative branches' alleged constitutional violations. The magistrate judge --concluding that Bush's "rambling, nonsensical, and conclusory allegations lack[ed] an arguable basis either in law or in fact" -- recommended that the complaint be dismissed without prejudice as frivolous under section 1915(e)(2). The district court adopted the magistrate judge's recommendation and dismissed the complaint.

In his two-page appellate brief, Bush argues that defendants "have failed to observe and follow the Constitution of the United States as written, and in doing so, have violated [his] 14th Amendment, Equal Protection Rights." Bush makes no specific argument in support of his claim. Instead, he merely sets forth a hypothetical traffic court case that is unrelated to his original complaint. "While we read 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). Because Bush failed to raise adequately issues that were before the district court, he has abandoned all issues on appeal.*

AFFIRMED.

*Even if Bush had not abandoned his arguments on appeal, we agree that Bush's complaint lacked "arguable merit either in law or fact." See Bilal v. Driver, 251 F.3d 1346, 1349 (11th Cir. 2001). Thus, the district court did not abuse its discretion in dismissing Bush's complaint as frivolous. See id.