

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 20-10631  
Non-Argument Calendar

---

D.C. Docket No. 5:19-cv-00437-RBD-PRL

MARCELLUS CHARLEMAGNE,

Petitioner-Appellant,

versus

SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,

Respondent-Appellee.

---

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

---

(November 13, 2020)

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

PER CURIAM:

Marcellus Charlemagne, a state prisoner, appeals *pro se* the dismissal of his petition for a writ of habeas corpus as second or successive. Charlemagne abandoned any challenge he could have made to the dismissal of his petition by raising in his initial brief only arguments about his state conviction. *See Timson v. Sampson*, 518 F.3d 870, 874 (11th Cir. 2008). Charlemagne argues for the first time in his reply brief that his petition is not second or successive, but “we do not address arguments raised for the first time in a pro se litigant’s reply brief,” *id.* We affirm the dismissal of Charlemagne’s petition.

**AFFIRMED.**