

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

In the  
United States Court of Appeals  
For the Eleventh Circuit

---

No. 25-13798  
Non-Argument Calendar

---

ROY MOSLEY,

*Petitioner-Appellant,*

*versus*

WARDEN, FCC COLEMAN - LOW,

*Respondent-Appellee.*

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Middle District of Florida  
D.C. Docket No. 5:23-cv-00313-WWB-PRL

---

Before JORDAN, ROSENBAUM, and NEWSOM, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

In July 2023, Roy Mosley, proceeding pro se, filed an amended habeas corpus petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2241, alleging that the BOP improperly revoked his home confinement. He also

reported that he was pursuing various administrative remedies within the Federal Bureau of Prisons (“BOP”). In June 2024, the district court entered a final order and judgment dismissing Mosley’s petition.

In October 2025, Mosley filed in this case a document appealing the BOP’s April 2025 denial of his administrative tort claim under the Federal Tort Claim Act (“FTCA”). Relying on the same facts and arguments as his § 2241 petition, he argued that the BOP erred in denying his “administrative remedy” and requested damages under the FTCA. Mosley also attached a copy of the BOP’s April 2025 denial of his claim. The district court construed his filing as a notice of appeal from the June 2024 final order dismissing his petition.

As an initial matter, although the district court construed Mosley’s notice of appeal as appealing from the June 2024 final order, the notice does not evince an intent to appeal the district court’s final order or judgment. *See KH Outdoor, LLC v. City of Trussville*, 465 F.3d 1256, 1260 (11th Cir. 2006). It did not mention (1) his habeas petition; (2) the district court’s final order or judgment; or (3) this Court. And the relief sought is inapposite for appellate review of the district court’s dismissal of his habeas petition. Accordingly, we deem the construed notice of appeal as challenging only the BOP’s April 2025 denial of his administrative tort claim, as designated. Fed. R. App. P. 3(c)(1)(B).

25-13798

## Opinion of the Court

3

We lack jurisdiction to review the BOP's April 2025 denial of his administrative tort claim because it is not a district court order, and we cannot directly review administrative tort claim decisions. See 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (providing that the courts of appeals have jurisdiction over “appeals from all final decisions *of the district courts*” (emphasis added)); *United States v. Hohri*, 482 U.S. 64, 68-69 (1987) (applying § 1291 in a FTCA case); Fed. R. App. P. 15(a)(1) (providing that we have jurisdiction to review agency orders when such review is authorized by law); 28 U.S.C. § 1346(b)(1) (providing district courts with exclusive jurisdiction of tort claims against the United States); *id.* § 2675(a) (requiring an individual to first file an administrative claim with the appropriate federal agency before suing for money damages under the FTCA).

Accordingly, this appeal is DISMISSED, sua sponte, for lack of jurisdiction. All pending motions are DENIED as moot.