

United States Court of Appeals  
for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

April 13, 2021

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

---

No. 20-50398  
Summary Calendar

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*Plaintiff—Appellee,*

*versus*

JAN ABRAHAM NEL,

*Defendant—Appellant.*

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Texas  
USDC No. 3:17-CR-2152-1

---

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, JONES, and COSTA, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:\*

Jan Abraham Nel pleaded guilty to wire fraud, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1342. Nel appeals the district court’s denial of a pro se motion in which he sought the return of “all property seized since April 2016” in his criminal case, citing Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 41(g). He also appeals the

---

\* Pursuant to 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5.4.

No. 20-50398

denial of his motion seeking to recuse the district court judge, based on the judge's alleged bias, prejudice, and a conflict of interest. Further, he appeals the denial of a self-styled motion "Silence is Not an Option" where he argued that an examination of his case by the news media would expose violations of his constitutional rights during his prosecution for wire fraud. Nel has also moved for the appointment of counsel.

Though Nel appealed all three of the district court's orders denying his pro se motions, his brief mentions only the order denying his Rule 41(g) motion. Nel states on the first page of his brief that he is challenging the district court's denial of his Rule 41(g) motion, but he provides no supporting argument or citation to legal authority. He offers only a vague, unsupported allegation that the warrant supporting the search and seizure of his property was based on an affidavit that contained false statements. Nel does not elaborate on these allegedly false statements.

This court liberally construes briefs filed by pro se litigants. *Yohey v. Collins*, 985 F.2d 222, 225 (5th Cir. 1993). Nonetheless, even pro se parties must reasonably comply with Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 28(a)(8), which requires that the appellant's brief contain, among other things, an argument setting out the appellant's contentions and the reasons for them. *Id.* Because Nel has not addressed the district court's denial of his Rule 41(g) motion or his other pro se motions, he has abandoned any argument he could have raised regarding the court's rulings on his motions. *Id.* at 224-25.

The judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED. Nel's motion for the appointment of counsel is DENIED.