

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-10567
Non-Argument Calendar

D.C. Docket No. 5:11-cv-00079-CHW

EARL A. BRYANT,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

HUTCHINSON AUTO MALL,

Defendant-Appellee.

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

(September 6, 2012)

Before TJOFLAT, JORDAN and KRAVITCH, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

After review of the record and the parties' briefs, we affirm the district court's

dismissal of the complaint for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction. First, Earl Bryant's complaint against Hutchinson Auto Mall did not assert any federal claims. Thus, there was no federal-question jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331. Second, according to the complaint and its attachments, Mr. Bryant and Hutchinson Auto Mall were both citizens of Georgia, and Mr. Bryant sought only \$2,400 in damages. As a result, there was no diversity jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332. *See Underwriters at Lloyd's, London v. Osting-Schwinn*, 613 F.3d 1079, 1085 (11th Cir. 2010) ("For federal diversity jurisdiction to attach, all parties must be completely diverse and the amount in controversy must exceed \$75,000." (citations omitted)). Third, Mr. Bryant has failed to address the jurisdictional issues in his brief, and they are therefore waived. *See Sepulveda v. U.S. Att'y Gen.*, 401 F.3d 1226, 1228 n.2 (11th Cir. 2005) ("When an appellant fails to offer argument on an issue, that issue is abandoned.").

AFFIRMED.