

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

In the  
United States Court of Appeals  
For the Eleventh Circuit

---

No. 25-12267  
Non-Argument Calendar

---

IRVIN E. CARAWAY, II,

*Plaintiff-Appellant,*

*versus*

EQUIFAX,

*Defendant-Appellee.*

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of Georgia  
D.C. Docket No. 1:18-cv-04753-TWT

---

Before ROSENBAUM, NEWSOM, and BRANCH, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

We *sua sponte* vacate our March 27, 2026, decision dismissing this appeal as untimely. We conclude that the appeal is timely,<sup>1</sup> and we substitute this opinion in its place.

In June 2018, Irwin E. Caraway, II, proceeding *pro se*, filed a complaint against Equifax in the Northern District of Ohio, alleging that his personal information had been stolen in the 2017 Equifax data breach. He generally asserted claims under the Fair Credit Reporting Act and requested \$100 million in damages. On October 15, 2018, the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation transferred the case to a multidistrict litigation proceeding in the Northern District of Georgia for cases arising out of the Equifax data breach. In 2020, the district court entered an order granting final approval of a class action settlement.

In October 2024, Caraway moved to transfer the case to the Northern District of Ohio. On November 7, 2024, the district court entered an order denying Caraway’s motion, explaining that it “ha[d] no authority to transfer the case to another district,” as “[t]hat authority rest[ed] exclusively” with the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation. The court also noted that the case “was settled as part of the . . . [MDL] class action settlement.”

---

<sup>1</sup> Caraway filed a timely notice of appeal on December 3, 2024, but it was not signed. The signature requirement is not jurisdictional and may be satisfied after the expiration of the initial appeal period if the defective notice is otherwise timely. *Becker v. Montgomery*, 532 U.S. 757, 760 (2001). We conclude that Caraway corrected the deficiency by filing a signed notice of appeal with this Court on January 16, 2025.

25-12267

Opinion of the Court

3

We conclude that we lack jurisdiction over the transfer order because “a transfer order is not appealable as a final order under 28 U.S.C. § 1291.” *Grayson v. K Mart Corp.*, 79 F.3d 1086, 1094 (11th Cir. 1996). Accordingly, we dismiss this appeal for lack of jurisdiction.