

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

In the
United States Court of Appeals
For the Eleventh Circuit

No. 26-10269
Non-Argument Calendar

REGINALD EUGENE BULLS,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

CHRIS CONELY,

Defendant,

CHRIS CONNOLLY,

Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Alabama
D.C. Docket No. 5:23-cv-01109-CLM-GMB

Before BRASHER, ABUDU, and KIDD Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

In October 2023, Reginald Bulls, an Alabama prisoner proceeding pro se, filed an amended complaint alleging that a prosecutor violated his constitutional rights by defaming him during a parole hearing. On August 16, 2024, the district court entered an order dismissing the case without prejudice, and the clerk entered judgment the same day.

Bulls mailed to us a civil appeal statement on a pre-printed form containing the district court's case number, which we construed as a notice of appeal. On the form, Bulls circled the phrase "Final Judgment 28 U.S.C. § 1291" under a subheading titled "Nature of Judgment," and "Dismissal" under another subheading titled "Type of Order." Bulls stated that he had a parole hearing in which the prosecutor made false statements that violated his constitutional rights.

We issued jurisdictional questions ("JQs") asking the parties to address which ruling(s) the notice of appeal evinces an intent to appeal from and whether the notice is timely to challenge the ruling(s).

Bulls, the only party who has appeared in the action, responds by addressing the district court's dismissal of his case. He also argues that he submitted evidence concerning the prosecutor's alleged perjury at the parole hearing. Bulls concludes by requesting that we address the merits of his claims.

Liberal­ly construed, Bulls's notice of appeal evinces an intent to appeal from the August 16, 2024 judgment dismissing his case. That is because Bulls addressed in his JQ response the district

26-10269

Opinion of the Court

3

court's dismissal of his case and the allegations of perjury by the prosecutor at the parole hearing, and he requested that we address the merits of his claims. Additionally, Bulls circled items on his notice of appeal form that demonstrated his intent to challenge the final dismissal order and accompanying judgment.

However, Bulls's notice of appeal is untimely to challenge the judgment. Regardless of whether Bulls's notice of appeal is deemed filed under the prison mailbox rule on December 29, 2025, or January 8, 2026—the two dates that appear on his notice—it is untimely because the deadline to appeal the judgment was September 16, 2024. *See Green v. Drug Enf't Admin.*, 606 F.3d 1296, 1300-02 (11th Cir. 2010) (holding that a timely notice of appeal is a jurisdictional requirement in a civil case); Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(1)(A) (providing that a notice of appeal must be filed within 30 days after the judgment or order appealed from is entered if there is not a federal party), 4(c)(1) (providing that a pro se prisoner's notice of appeal is deemed filed on the date that he delivered it to prison authorities for mailing); *Jeffries v. United States*, 748 F.3d 1310, 1314 (11th Cir. 2014) (explaining that, if that date is not known, and absent contrary evidence, we will assume that a prisoner delivered the filing on the date they signed it).

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