

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

In the
United States Court of Appeals
For the Eleventh Circuit

No. 24-11371

DEVIN BROSNAN,
GARRETT ROLFE,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

versus

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS,

In her individual and official capacities,

PAUL HOWARD,

In his individual and official capacities,

DONALD HANNAH,

In his individual and official capacities,

CLINT RUCKER,

In his individual and official capacities,

THE CITY OF ATLANTA, GEORGIA, et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Georgia
D.C. Docket No. 1:22-cv-02337-LMM

Before BRANCH and LUCK, Circuit Judges, and SCHLESINGER,^{*} District Judge.

PER CURIAM:

Police officers Devin Brosnan and Garrett Rolfe brought federal- and state-law claims against Fulton County, Georgia, the city of Atlanta, and a former mayor, police chief, district attorney, assistant district attorney, and investigator. Brosnan and Rolfe's claims were almost identical to the ones brought by three other police officers—Mark Gardner, Lonnie Hood, and Ivory Streeter—in a lawsuit presenting similar facts. A district judge in the Northern District of Georgia granted motions to dismiss the *Gardner* lawsuit. And a different judge in the same district granted motions to dismiss Brosnan and Rolfe's claims.

The officers in both cases separately appealed the dismissals but the *Gardner* appeal moved first. Because the two lawsuits were so similar, we stayed Brosnan and Rolfe's appeal pending our decision in *Gardner*. That decision came out earlier this year. In *Gardner v. Bottoms*, No. 23-12772, 2025 WL 799282 (11th Cir. Mar. 13,

^{*} Honorable Harvey E. Schlesinger, United States District Judge, for the Middle District of Florida, sitting by designation.

24-11371

Opinion of the Court

3

2025), we affirmed the district court’s dismissal of the three officers’ complaint in a twenty-nine-page opinion.

With *Gardner* decided, we lifted the stay in Brosnan and Rolfe’s appeal and ordered the parties to file supplemental briefs to address the impact of our opinion. Having reviewed the supplemental briefs, and after hearing from the parties at oral argument, we see no material difference between *Gardner* and this case. For the same reasons we detailed in our *Gardner* opinion, we affirm the dismissal of Brosnan and Rolfe’s claims.

AFFIRMED.