

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 18-12847  
Non-Argument Calendar

---

D.C. Docket No. 0:17-cv-60597-WPD

RAYMOND A. HANNA EL,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

STATE OF FLORIDA,  
BROWARD COUNTY MUNICIPALITIES,  
CITY OF LAUDERHILL,  
CARLOS REBELLO,  
MICHAEL MAUER, et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

---

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

---

(June 14, 2019)

Before ED CARNES, Chief Judge, BRANCH, and FAY, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Raymond Hanna El, proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 suit, appeals the district court's denial of his petition for a "writ of quo warranto," which the district court construed as a motion for reconsideration. We review only for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion for reconsideration. Richardson v. Johnson, 598 F.3d 734, 740 (11th Cir. 2010) (per curiam). As best we can tell, Hanna El contends that the district court should have allowed him to relitigate the subject of his motion for reconsideration. But "[a] motion for reconsideration cannot be used to relitigate old matters." Id. (quotation marks omitted).

Hanna El also appeals the denial of his petition for a "writ of error objection." The district court construed that petition as a motion to recuse and denied it on the merits, but we construe it as a motion for relief from judgment under Rule 60(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure because it sought the vacatur of the district court's prior rulings based on an alleged past need to recuse. We review only for abuse of discretion the denial of a Rule 60(b) motion. Toole v. Baxter Healthcare Corp., 235 F.3d 1307, 1316 (11th Cir. 2000). Hanna El appears to argue that the district court judge should have recused because the judge's rulings against Hanna El show that the judge was biased against him. Rulings

adverse to a party, however, are not enough to show bias that warrants recusal, Hamm v. Members of Bd. of Regents, 708 F.2d 647, 651 (11th Cir. 1983), and Hanna El has not shown any other grounds for relief under Rule 60(b).

In short, the district court did not abuse its discretion by denying Hanna El's motions.

**AFFIRMED.**