

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 19-11749
Non-Argument Calendar

D.C. Docket No. 1:19-cv-20847-RNS

JULIO ARMANDO BRUNET,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendant-Appellant.

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

(October 22, 2019)

Before TJOFLAT, JILL PRYOR, and ANDERSON, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

I.

Julio Brunet, a prisoner proceeding *pro se*, filed a writ of mandamus under 28 U.S.C. § 1361. The District Court denied the writ *sua sponte*, finding that Brunet failed to state a claim upon which relief could be granted. We agree and affirm.

II.

Brunet filed a Uniform Commercial Code (“UCC”) document with the court in his original criminal proceeding which purported to transfer legal title to his freedom—and 936 million dollars—from the United States to himself. He argues that the district judge’s failure to respond to this UCC filing amounted to a governmental default admission of its liability to him. Therefore, Brunet’s writ seeks his immediate release from custody and payment for breach of contract. Regarding the UCC document and his legal argument, Brunet stated:

“This Transfer Statement is recorded by the Secured Party natural man Julio Armando Brunet, agent for corporate citizen Julio Armando Brunet, because the United States has accepted its dishonor, default, void judgment, and revocation of sentence, in connection with the obligation secured by collateral (prisoner # 05079-104) All rights and title related to the holding of collateral have transferred to Julio Armando Brunet, and the United States accepted the obligation to pay damages of \$ 936 million and release the collateral (prisoner # 05079-104). . . . As the natural man, Julio Armando Brunet, being the secured party of the corporate citizen Julio Armando Brunet, and its holder in due course, I hereby claim my right to take possession of corporate citizen Julio Armando Brunet from the United States, who continue to unlawfully hold it in the (BOP) as prisoner # 05079-104.”

III.

We review *de novo* a district court's *sua sponte* dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1) and § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) for failure to state a claim. *Leal v. Ga. Dep't of Corrs.*, 254 F.3d 1276, 1278–79 (11th Cir. 2001). *Pro se* pleadings are liberally construed and held to less stringent standards than those drafted by lawyers, but they must still suggest a factual basis for a claim. *Jones v. Fla. Parole Comm'n*, 787 F.3d 1105, 1107 (11th Cir. 2015).

Here, construing Brunet's pleadings as liberally as we can, we find Brunet's claims to be outlandish to the point of incomprehensibility. We can imagine no set of circumstances in which Brunet's legal argument would have merit. Therefore, the District Court properly denied the writ because in no way, shape, or form could Brunet's pleading entitle him to relief.

AFFIRMED.