

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 16-16474  
Non-Argument Calendar

---

D.C. Docket No. 2:15-cv-00365-SPC-CM

EDWARD J. JABLONSKI,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

THE TRAVELERS COMPANIES, INC.,

Defendant - Appellee.

---

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

---

(October 23, 2018)

Before WILLIAM PRYOR, MARTIN, and ANDERSON, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Edward J. Jablonski, proceeding pro se, appeals the denial of two Rule 60(b) motions to reopen his action against The Travelers Companies, Inc., as well as an

order striking two complaints he filed after the District Court dismissed his second amended complaint with prejudice and entered final judgment.

We read appellate briefs filed by pro se litigants liberally. Timson v. Sampson, 518 F.3d 870, 874 (11th Cir. 2008). Even so, we may not construct arguments where none exist, Cofield v. Ala. Pub. Serv. Comm'n, 936 F.2d 512, 514 n.2 (11th Cir. 1991), and generally will not consider issues that the appellant does not include in his initial brief. Timson, 518 F.3d at 874.

Mr. Jablonski's complaints in the district court and his initial brief on appeal allege unspecified frauds by Travelers. His brief also indicates he has previously experienced an aneurysm and may suffer from aphasia and related impairments. His brief expresses stress and worry because of ongoing litigation, as well as fear of suffering another aneurysm.

The court sympathizes with Mr. Jablonski's circumstances, which clearly make litigating on his own behalf difficult. However, we cannot discern any argument from his brief for why the district court erred by denying his post-judgment motions. See Timson, 518 F.3d at 874. We therefore affirm.

**AFFIRMED.**