

# Court Had Jurisdiction to Consider District Court Order Not Referenced in the Notice of Appeal

May 01, 2015

In *Davila v. Gladden*, 777 F.3d 1198 (11th Cir. 2015), the defendants argued that the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals should not consider arguments regarding the district court's order granting the defendants' motion to dismiss claims addressing the plaintiff's religious rights under the First Amendment and the Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA), 42 U.S.C. § 2000bb, because the plaintiff only referenced the district court's order granting final summary judgment to defendants on his remaining claims in the notice of appeal. *Davila*, 777 F.3d at 1209 n.5. The Court initially noted that Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 3(c)(1)(B) provides that a notice of appeal "must ... designate the judgment, order, or part thereof being appealed," and that the plaintiff did not reference the order granting the defendants' motion to dismiss claims regarding monetary relief under the RFRA. *Id.* Nevertheless, the Court reasoned that it had jurisdiction to address these claims because the issues at the motion-to-dismiss stage and the summary judgment stage were "inextricably intertwined" because they were based on the plaintiff's religious rights under the same set of facts and it had previously held that "the appeal from a final judgment draws in question all prior non-final orders and rulings which produced the judgment." *Id.* (citing *Barfield v. Brierton*, 883 F.2d 923, 930 (11th Cir. 1989) (footnote omitted), and *Hill v. BellSouth Telecomm., Inc.*, 364 F.3d 1308, 1313 (11th Cir.2004) (citation omitted)). Moreover, the Court observed that the defendants had not been prejudiced because they were able to argue the money damages questions in their brief before the Court despite any lack of clarity of the notice of appeal. *Id.* Finally, the Court referred to this error or omission as a mere technicality in the notice of appeal insufficient to preclude the Court from considering the merits of the claims. *Id.* (quoting *Foman v. Davis*, 371 U.S. 178, 181 (1962))

Republished with permission by the American Bar Association

*disseminated in any form or by any means or downloaded or stored in an electronic database or retrieval system without the express written consent of the American Bar Association.*

## **Related Practices**

### [Appellate & Trial Support](#)

©2024 Carlton Fields, P.A. Carlton Fields practices law in California through Carlton Fields, LLP. Carlton Fields publications should not be construed as legal advice on any specific facts or circumstances. The contents are intended for general information and educational purposes only, and should not be relied on as if it were advice about a particular fact situation. The distribution of this publication is not intended to create, and receipt of it does not constitute, an attorney-client relationship with Carlton Fields. This publication may not be quoted or referred to in any other publication or proceeding without the prior written consent of the firm, to be given or withheld at our discretion. To request reprint permission for any of our publications, please use our Contact Us form via the link below. The views set forth herein are the personal views of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the firm. This site may contain hypertext links to information created and maintained by other entities. Carlton Fields does not control or guarantee the accuracy or completeness of this outside information, nor is the inclusion of a link to be intended as an endorsement of those outside sites.