

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 20-14271  
Non-Argument Calendar

---

D.C. Docket No. 1:17-cr-20701-MGC-4

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

JORGE CONTINO VALHUERDIS,

Defendant-Appellant.

---

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

---

(May 6, 2021)

Before WILLIAM PRYOR, Chief Judge, WILSON and LAGOA, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Jorge Valhuerdis, a federal prisoner, appeals *pro se* the denial of his motion to compel trial counsel to supply a copy of the criminal case record. The government

moves for a summary affirmance and to stay the briefing schedule. The government argues that Valhuerdis has abandoned any argument that he could have made challenging the denial of his motion. “[W]e read briefs filed by *pro se* litigants liberally,” but Valhuerdis fails to mention, let alone contest the denial of, his motion to compel in his brief on appeal, so we deem that issue abandoned. *See Timson v. Sampson*, 518 F.3d 870, 874 (11th Cir. 2008). Because the “position [of the United States] . . . is clearly right as a matter of law so that there [is] no substantial question as to the outcome of the case,” *Groendyke Transp., Inc. v. Davis*, 406 F.2d 1158, 1162 (5th Cir. 1969), we grant the motion for summary affirmance and dismiss as moot the motion to stay the briefing schedule.

We **AFFIRM** the denial of Valheurdís’s motion to compel, and we **DISMISS** as moot the motion to stay the briefing schedule.