

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-13632
Non-Argument Calendar

D.C. Docket No. 1:12-cv-01299-ODE

JONATHAN BRUCE COLLINS,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

FULTON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT,

Defendant-Appellee,

NICK CASSIDY, et al.,

Defendants.

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

(May 15, 2015)

Before HULL, ROSENBAUM, and ANDERSON, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Jonathan Collins, a former teacher, appeals the district court's grant of defendant Fulton County School District's motion for summary judgment and denial of his motion for reconsideration as to his complaint alleging wrongful termination. Pertinent to this appeal, Collins raised termination claims under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, 29 U.S.C § 623, and the Americans With Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12112(a). On appeal, Collins argues the merits of the disposition of the underlying summary judgment claim, as well as the timeliness of his motion for reconsideration.

As we previously ordered, prior to the parties' filing of briefs in this case, we limited Collins's appeal to his motion for reconsideration because he failed to file a timely appeal as to the district court's denial of his underlying motion for summary judgment. However, Collins does not argue in his brief that the district court abused its discretion¹ in denying the motion for reconsideration, so Collins has abandoned the only outstanding issue on appeal. *See Timson v. Sampson*, 518 F.3d 870, 874 (11th Cir. 2008) ("While we read briefs filed by *pro se* litigants liberally, . . . issues not briefed on appeal by a *pro se* litigant are deemed abandoned . . ."). Moreover, even if we addressed the limited issue on appeal –

¹ We review a district court's ruling on a motion for reconsideration for an abuse of discretion. *Richardson v. Johnson*, 598 F.3d 734, 740 (11th Cir. 2010).

whether the district court abused its discretion in denying Collins' motion for reconsideration – we would not conclude that there was an abuse of discretion.

AFFIRMED.