

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-12695
Non-Argument Calendar

D.C. Docket No. 0:13-cv-61109-RSR

RONALD R. ADDVENSKY,

Plaintiff-Appellant.

versus

JIM LNU,
Pharmacy Manager - CVS,
CVS PHARMACIES CORP,
STATE OF FLORIDA,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Florida

(November 6, 2013)

Before PRYOR, MARTIN and BLACK, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Ronald Addvensky, proceeding *pro se*, appeals the *sua sponte* dismissal with prejudice of his complaint brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against Jim, last name unknown, a CVS pharmacy manager, CVS Pharmacies Corporation, and the State of Florida. The complaint was not clear in its allegations, but the district court discerned causes of action for (1) breach of contract between Addvensky and CVS; (2) a drug-trafficking conspiracy among Jim LNU, CVS, and the State of Florida; (3) violation of the Equal Protection Clause; (4) discrimination against physicians in Florida; and (5) violation of the Due Process Clause. Addvensky argues broadly on appeal that the district court was biased and incorrect.

Generally, if a legal claim or argument has not been briefed before this Court, with citations to authority and parts of the record relied upon, it is deemed abandoned and its merits will not be addressed. *Access Now, Inc. v. Southwest Airlines Co.*, 385 F.3d 1324, 1330 (11th Cir. 2004); Fed. R. App. P. 28(a)(9)(A). We construe *pro se* briefs liberally, but will not argue an appellant's case for him. *See GJR Investments Inc. v. County of Escambia, Fla.*, 132 F.3d 1359, 1369 (11th Cir.1998), *overruled on other grounds as recognized in Randall v. Scott*, 610 F.3d 701, 709 (11th Cir. 2010). A *pro se* litigant who offers no argument on an issue abandons the issue on appeal. *See Timson v. Sampson*, 518 F.3d 870, 874 (11th Cir. 2008).

Addvensky's appellate brief offers little to go on and follows none of the requirements of Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 28. We cannot determine which, if any, of the district court's particular rulings he challenges. Accordingly, Addvensky has abandoned any argument on appeal. *See Timson*, 518 F.3d at 874; *Access Now*, 385 F.3d at 1330. Even if Addvensky had preserved issues for appeal, we could discern no error in the district court's opinion.

For the foregoing reasons, we affirm the district court's dismissal of Addvensky's complaint with prejudice.

AFFIRMED.