

Case No.: Not Yet Assigned

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF
THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

ANTHONY B. LEWIS, MD.

Plaintiff – Appellee

Vs.

HCA FLORIDA LAWNWOOD HOSPITAL

Defendants- Appellants.

A PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERT FROM
THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS- ELEVENTH CIRCUIT
Case No. 25-10386

APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

Roderick Andrew Lee Ford, Esq.
The Methodist Law Centre
5745 S.W. 75th Street, # 149
Gainesville, Florida 32608
(352) 559-5544
Email: admin@methodistlawcentre.com

Attorney For Appellee

APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

This is an original Application for an Extension of Time for Anthony B. Lewis, MD's ("Dr. Lewis") to file his Petition for Writ of Certiorari.

This original Application is postmarked on January 7, 2025, and it has been e-filed at the U. S. Supreme Court on the same date.

Dr. Lewis filed his Motion to Consolidate two appellate cases (11th Cir. case no. 25-11291 and 11th Cir. case no. 25-10386) on 04-21-2025. **Exhibit A.**

The Eleventh Circuit rendered its opinion denying all relief which Dr. Lewis sought on 09-11-2025. **Exhibit B.**

Dr. Lewis filed a timely Petition For Rehearing; and the Eleventh Circuit denied that petition on 10-30-2025. **Exhibit C.**

Therefore, we believe that the 90-day deadline for Dr. Lewis to file his Petition for a Writ of Certiorari in this Court runs on or about January 29, 2026.

Due to Dr. Lewis' *exigent circumstances* that constitute just and good cause, a thirty-day time extension to **March 1, 2026** is herein requested.

II.

The Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Certiorari, together with its attached appendices, are scheduled to be prepared and forwarded to an official supreme court printing service by February 15, 2026, to wit:

United States Commercial Printing Company, LLC
(202) 866-8558

REASONS FOR THE TIME EXTENSION

The Petitioner, Dr. Lewis, and the undersigned counsel are currently litigating a related administrative proceeding in the nature of a physician's peer review appeal that involve similar issues, with a scheduled hearing date on January 23, 2026.

This physician peer review hearing involve the same Parties and address many of the same issues.

Due to the overlap in time-period in Dr. Lewis and undersigned counsel are required to prepare for this hearing, and also to prepare and file a Petition for Writ of Certiorari in this Court, Dr. Lewis has encountered undue exigent circumstances that justify granting a 30-day extension of time.

The petitioner Dr. Lewis thus needs additional time until at least March 1, 2026 to raise necessary revenue to file a timely, professional petition through

means of a Publisher of Supreme Court Briefs and Petitions. Otherwise, undue economic or financial hardship prevents them from filing the said petition.

At this time, the Petitioner, Dr. Lewis, is practicing medicine while his Medical Office is currently operated under a Chapter 11 Bankruptcy court order; his assets are being carefully administered; and his income is parceled out and constrained to a monthly operating budget. He needs the additional 30 days to fund both the (a) peer-review appeal hearing on 01/23/2026 and (b) the filing of his Petition for Writ of Certiorari to this Court.

- A. To alleviate this economic/ financial hardship, the Petitioner seeks at a minimum of a 30 day time extension to file the Petition for Writ of Certiorari. This would make the due date: March 1, 2026 [instead of January 29, 2026].
- B. There is “reasonable or good cause” for this extension owing to the financial/ economic distress of the Petitioner, which can be alleviated with the above-requested accommodation for time-extension.
- C. There is no prior evidence of past delays or abuses of court process on the part of the Petitioner, during any of the litigation in the U.S. District Court or in the U. S. Court of Appeals.

D. There is no reasonable basis or material evidence to suggest that the opposing parties will in any way be prejudiced by a 30- day time extension.

For the reasons set forth above, “good cause” exists and supports granting at least a 30-day time extension for this case. The new due date would be March 1 2026.

This Application is being mailed via Fed. Express courier service on Wednesday, January 7, 2026.

The said Application has also been e-filed on this Court’s website.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

DATED: 10 February 2026 [Refiled/Served]

DATED: 7 January 2026

/s/ Roderick Andrew Lee Ford

Attorney for Anthony B. Lewis, MD

FBN: 0072620

The Methodist Law Centre

Post Office Box 357091

Gainesville, Florida 32635

(352) 559-5544

(800) 792-2241 facsimile

Emai: admin@methodistlawcentre.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the Appellee's
Objection to Record on Appeal has been served via CM-ECF electronic filing upon
[10 February 2026](#)
the following persons or entities on 7 January 2026, as follows:

Lash & Goldberg
ATTN: Martin B. Goldberg, Esq., et al.
100 SE 2nd St, Ste 1200
Miami, FL 33131-2131
Office: 305-783-2208
Fax: 305-347-4050

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

/s/ Roderick Andrew Lee Ford

Roderick Andrew Lee Ford, Esq.
The Methodist Law Centre
admin@methodistlawcentre.com



CERTIFICATE COMPLIANCE

This document complies with the typeface requirements of FRAP 32(a)(5) and the type-style requirements of FRAP 32(a)(6). This document ALSO complies with the word limit of FRAP 28.1(e), excluding the parts of the document exempted by FRAP 32(f), containing 1040 words.

/s/ Roderick Andrew Lee Ford
Roderick Andrew Lee Ford, Esq.

Certificate of Interested Persons and Corporate Disclosure Statement

The Plaintiff-Appellant, Roderick Ford, pursuant to the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, respectfully files this Corporate Disclosure Statement and Certificate of Interested Parties. All parties who have an outcome or vested interest in the outcome of this appeal include the following:

1. Anthony B. Lewis, MD (Plaintiff-Appellant)
2. Hon. Donald M. Middlebrooks (District Court Judge)
3. HCA Florida Lawnwood Hospital (Defendant-Appellee)
4. Martin B. Golberg, Esq. (Trial and Appellate Counsel for Defendant-Appellant)
5. Anna Price Lazarus (Trial and Appellate Counsel for Defendant-Appellant)
6. Lynnette Cortes Mhatre (Trial and Appellate Counsel for Defendant-Appellant)
7. Ford, Roderick O. (Trial and Appellate Counsel for Plaintiff-Appellant)
8. Lash Golberg Fineberg, LLP (Law Firm for Defendants-Appellants)
9. The Methodist Law Centre (Law Firm for Plaintiff-Appellant)
10. The P.M.J.A. Legal Defense Fund, Inc. (Law Firm of Plaintiff-Appellant)

There are no other interested parties to this appeal.

EXHIBIT A

U.S. 11TH CIR. COURT OF APPEALS

MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE APPEALS

ORDER AFFIRMING LOWER COURT

ORDER DENYING PET. FOR RE-HEARING

Compose

Inbox 10,810

Starred

Snoozed

Sent

Drafts 393

Purchases 59

More

Labels

25-10386-CC Anthony Lewis v. HCA Florida Lawnwood Hospital "Motion filed Consolidate Appeals" (2:24-cv-14147-DMM) Inbox x



ecf_help@ca11.uscourts.gov
to me

Mon, Apr 21, 2025, 2:37 PM

NOTE TO PUBLIC ACCESS USERS Judicial Conference of the United States policy permits attorneys of record and parties se litigants) to receive one free electronic copy of all documents filed electronically, if receipt is required by law or directed by t fees apply to all other users. To avoid later charges, download a copy of each document during this first viewing.

United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit

Notice of Docket Activity

The following transaction was filed on 04/21/2025

Case Name: Anthony Lewis v. HCA Florida Lawnwood Hospital

Case Number: 25-10386

Document(s): 16

Reply

Forward





Rev. Roderick Andrew Lee Ford, ESQ <methodistlawcentre@gmail.com>

**25-10386-EE Anthony Lewis v. HCA Florida Lawnwood Hospital "Opinion Issued
Denied Sanctions" (2:24-cv-14147-DMM)**

1 message

ecf_help@ca11.uscourts.gov <ecf_help@ca11.uscourts.gov>
To: methodistlawcentre@gmail.com

Thu, Sep 11, 2025 at 12:37 PM

NOTE TO PUBLIC ACCESS USERS Judicial Conference of the United States policy permits attorneys of record and parties in a case (including pro se litigants) to receive one free electronic copy of all documents filed electronically, if receipt is required by law or directed by the filer. PACER access fees apply to all other users. To avoid later charges, download a copy of each document during this first viewing.

United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit

Notice of Docket Activity

The following transaction was filed on 09/11/2025

Case Name: Anthony Lewis v. HCA Florida Lawnwood Hospital

Case Number: 25-10386

Document(s): 40

Docket Text:

Opinion issued by court as to Appellant Anthony Lewis. Decision: Affirmed. Opinion type: Non-Published. Opinion method: Per Curiam. Motion filed by Appellant Anthony Lewis is DENIED. [34]; Motion for sanctions filed by Appellant Anthony Lewis is DENIED. [33], Motion for sanctions filed by Appellee HCA Florida Lawnwood Hospital is DENIED. [30]; Motion to supplement the record filed by Appellant Anthony Lewis is DENIED. [26]. (See 09/11/2025 opinion)(WHP/BL/CRW) The opinion is also available through the Court's Opinions page at this link <http://www.ca11.uscourts.gov/opinions>.

Notice will be electronically mailed to:

Clerk - Southern District of Florida, Clerk of Court
Roderick Andrew Lee Ford
Martin Barry Goldberg
Anna Price Lazarus

The following document(s) are associated with this transaction:

Document Description: Opinion

Original Filename: 202510386.pdf

Electronic Document Stamp:

[STAMP acecfStamp_ID=1160056652 [Date=09/11/2025] [FileNumber=10554124-0] [383f77232c6280defce178bc7d936cd720a702d399f65b98048ea9306de625f73355abc38328a31f78fee1513ced4ce8c2ead25fb2301806056afce9c4b1d4e0]]

Document Description: OPIN-1 Notice to Counsel/Parties

Original Filename: /opt/ACECF/live/forms/DjuannaClark_2510386_10554124_OPIN-1NtcofIssuanceofOpinion_300.pdf

Electronic Document Stamp:

[STAMP acecfStamp_ID=1160056652 [Date=09/11/2025] [FileNumber=10554124-1] [96b62062cd136c4610c9cbcc40f088f59aa8f4016eeb7a64fa6ccc38b2a4f52a63bf9c3f2be898285610072e3fa26742f36f28fb15cc12ad102d1ba49a68942e]]

Recipients:

- Clerk - Southern District of Florida, Clerk of Court
- Roderick Andrew Lee Ford
- Martin Barry Goldberg
- Anna Price Lazarus

- Compose
- Inbox10,810
- Starred
- Snoozed
- Sent
- Drafts393
- Purchases59
- More

Labels

NOTE TO PUBLIC ACCESS USERS Judicial Conference of the United States policy permits attorneys of record and parties se litigants) to receive one free electronic copy of all documents filed electronically, if receipt is required by law or directed by 1 fees apply to all other users. To avoid later charges, download a copy of each document during this first viewing.

United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit

Notice of Docket Activity

The following transaction was filed on 10/30/2025

Case Name: Anthony Lewis v. HCA Florida Lawnwood Hospital
Case Number: 25-10386
Document(s): 43

Docket Text:
ORDER: The Petition(s) for Rehearing are DENIED and no Judge in regular active service on the Court having requested that the Court for Rehearing En Banc filed by Appellant Anthony Lewis are DENIED. [43]

Notice will be electronically mailed to:

Roderick Andrew Lee Ford
Martin Barry Goldhamer

Reply

Forward

😊



Rev. Roderick Andrew Lee Ford, ESQ <methodistlawcentre@gmail.com>

25-10386-EE Anthony Lewis v. HCA Florida Lawnwood Hospital "Mandate Issued" (2:24-cv-14147-DMM)

2 messages

ecf_help@ca11.uscourts.gov <ecf_help@ca11.uscourts.gov>
To: methodistlawcentre@gmail.com

Mon, Nov 10, 2025 at 12:00 PM

*****NOTE TO PUBLIC ACCESS USERS***** Judicial Conference of the United States policy permits attorneys of record and parties in a case (including pro se litigants) to receive one free electronic copy of all documents filed electronically, if receipt is required by law or directed by the filer. PACER access fees apply to all other users. To avoid later charges, download a copy of each document during this first viewing.

United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit

Notice of Docket Activity

The following transaction was filed on 11/10/2025

Case Name: Anthony Lewis v. HCA Florida Lawnwood Hospital
Case Number: 25-10386
Document(s): 44

Docket Text:

Mandate issued as to Appellant Anthony Lewis.

Notice will be electronically mailed to:

Clerk - Southern District of Florida, Clerk of Court
Roderick Andrew Lee Ford
Martin Barry Goldberg
Anna Price Lazarus

The following document(s) are associated with this transaction:

Document Description: MDT-1 Notice to Counsel/Parties

Original Filename: /opt/ACECF/live/forms/NicoleRodgers_2510386_10599390_MDT-1LetterIssuingMandate_288.pdf

Electronic Document Stamp:

[STAMP acecfStamp_ID=1160056652 [Date=11/10/2025] [FileNumber=10599390-1] [6720051f87f2c4dd7b14bd73845a88e2559f39ba8b32e5e1ec5069b03ad0aba84c980df309f4e53a944b92b0bd04dd8b6fcb118ef76783f7b36decf5abd4b64d]]

Recipients:

- Clerk - Southern District of Florida, Clerk of Court
- Roderick Andrew Lee Ford
- Martin Barry Goldberg
- Anna Price Lazarus

Document Description: Mandate Issued

Original Filename: 25-10386 Mandate.pdf

Electronic Document Stamp:

[STAMP acecfStamp_ID=1160056652 [Date=11/10/2025] [FileNumber=10599390-0] [10c28b7682ce018b29b70a22df6a378a965b2e25dd94c869f86764488eb2911dc522df014e3e677901b93d496041fca0a86b6e4eb901ff8e663a8b4b0f6d2ce3]]

Case No.: 25-10386

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT**

ANTHONY B. LEWIS, M.D.

Plaintiff – Appellant

Vs.

HCA FLORIDA LAWNWOOD HOSPITAL

Defendants- Appellee.

A DIRECT APPEAL OF A CIVIL CASE FROM
THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT- SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
Case No. 2:24-cv-14147-DMM

MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE APPELLATE CASES

Roderick Andrew Lee Ford, Esq.
The Methodist Law Centre
5745 S.W. 75th Street, # 149
Gainesville, Florida 32608
(352) 559-5544
Email: admin@methodistlawcentre.com

Attorney For Appellant

MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE APPELLATE CASES

NOW COMES the Appellant, Anthony B. Lewis, MD, pursuant to Rules 3(c)(4) and 3(c)(5)(A) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, and respectfully moves this Court to consolidate to pending appellate cases:

- a. *Lewis v. HCA Florida Lawnwood Hospital*, Case No. 25-10386
- b. *Lewis v. HCA Florida Lawnwood Hospital*, Case No. 25-11291

In support thereof, the undersigned respectfully states:

1. The above-referenced appellate cases
 - a. Involve the same parties; and,
 - b. involve the same issues.
2. The first Notice of Appeal was filed on February 5, 2025. This notice appealed the District Court's Order of Dismissal (Doc. # 83), which was also filed on February 5, 2025.
3. The District Court reserved jurisdiction over one of the issues contained in the Order of Dismissal (Doc. # 83), and it finally resolved that issue on March 24, 2025 (Doc. # 99).
4. The second Notice of Appeal was filed on April 17, 2025 and this notice also appealed the District Court's Orders of Dismissal docketed on 2/05/2025 (Doc. # 83) and 04/17/2025 (Doc. # 99).

5. The Appellant's Opening Initial Brief, which was filed on April 17, 2025, fully addresses and briefs all of the legal issues included in both final orders, to wit: the District Court's final order docketed on 2/05/2025 (Doc. # 83), and the final order docketed on 04/17/2025 (Doc. # 99).
6. For these reason, the Appellee will not be prejudiced by the consolidation.
7. The consolidation will promote judicial economy and principles of equity requiring just, inexpensive, and speedy resolution of legal issues.
8. The Appellant and Appellant's counsel have limited resources and thus litigating two separate appeals would be unduly financially burdensome.

MEMORANDUM OF LAW

Under Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 3(b)(2), this Court may consolidate separately filed "timely" appeals when those "appeals arise from the same . . . litigation in the District Court" and it "would be both efficient and equitable for the disposition of the appeals." *Chem One, Ltd. v. M/V RICKMERS GENOA*, 660 F.3d 626, 642 (2d Cir. 2011); see also *Devlin v. Transp. Commc'ns Int'l Union*, 175 F.3d 121, 130 (2d Cir. 1999) (holding that a court "should consider both equity and judicial economy" to determine "whether consolidation is appropriate in given circumstances"); *United States v. Nursey*, 696 F. App'x 983, 983 n.1 (11th Cir. 2017) (allowing appeals to be consolidated under Rule 3(b));

United States v. Washington, 573 F.2d 1121, 1123 (9th Cir. 1978) (court may consolidate appeals “where the court in its discretion deems it appropriate and [when it is] in the interests of justice”).

The standard for consolidation is met here. Consolidation would be the most efficient means of addressing the identical legal issues presented by these cases. Both appeals are timely and both arise out of the same final judgment.

CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, the Appellant respectfully moves this honorable Court to consolidate *Lewis v. HCA Fla. Lawnwood Hospital*, Case No. 25-11291 into Case No. 25-10386. All of the legal issues brief in the Appellant’s Opening Brief, in the above-captioned case, incorporate the legal issues in the new case (i.e., *Lewis v. HCA Fla. Lawnwood Hospital*, Case No. 25-11291).

DATED: 21 April 2025

/s/ Roderick Andrew Lee Ford
Attorney for Anthony B. Lewis, M.D.
FBN: 0072620
The Methodist Law Centre
5745 S.W. 75th Street
Gainesville, Florida 32608
(352) 559-5544
(800) 792-2241 facsimile
Email: admin@methodistlawcentre.com

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

This document complies with the typeface requirements of FRAP 32(a)(5) and the type-style requirements of FRAP 32(a)(6). This document ALSO complies with the word limit of FRAP 28.1(e), excluding the parts of the document exempted by FRAP 32(f), containing 991 words.

/s/ Roderick Andrew Lee Ford
Roderick Andrew Lee Ford, Esq.

Certificate of Interested Persons and Corporate Disclosure Statement¹

The Plaintiff-Appellant, Roderick Ford, pursuant to the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, respectfully files this Corporate Disclosure Statement and Certificate of Interested Parties. All parties who have an outcome or vested interest in the outcome of this appeal include the following:

1. Anthony B. Lewis, MD (Plaintiff-Appellant)
2. Hon. Donald M. Middlebrooks (District Court Judge)
3. HCA Florida Lawnwood Hospital (Defendant-Appellee)
4. Martin B. Golberg, Esq. (Trial and Appellate Counsel for Defendant-Appellant)
5. Anna Price Lazarus (Trial and Appellate Counsel for Defendant-Appellant)
6. Lynnette Cortes Mhatre (Trial and Appellate Counsel for Defendant-Appellant)
7. Ford, Roderick O. (Trial and Appellate Counsel for Plaintiff-Appellant)
8. Lash Golberg Fineberg, LLP (Law Firm for Defendants-Appellants)
9. The Methodist Law Centre (Law Firm for Plaintiff-Appellant)
10. The P.M.J.A. Legal Defense Fund, Inc. (Law Firm of Plaintiff-Appellant)

¹ The CIP contained in the second and all subsequent briefs filed may include only persons and entities omitted from the CIP contained in the first brief filed and in any other brief that has been filed. Filers who believe that the CIP contained in the first brief filed and in any other brief that has been filed is complete must certify to that effect.

There are no other interested parties to this appeal.²

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the Appellant's Initial Brief has been served via CM-ECF electronic filing upon the following persons or entities on April 21, 2025, as follows:

Lash & Goldberg
ATTN: Martin B. Goldberg, Esq., et al.
100 SE 2nd St Ste 1200
Miami, FL 33131-2131
Office: 305-783-2208
Fax: 305-347-4050

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

/s/ Roderick Andrew Lee Ford

Roderick Andrew Lee Ford, Esq.
The Methodist Law Centre
admin@methodistlawcentre.com



NOT FOR PUBLICATION

In the
United States Court of Appeals
For the Eleventh Circuit

No. 25-10386
Non-Argument Calendar

ANTHONY LEWIS, M.D.,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

HCA FLORIDA LAWNWOOD HOSPITAL,

Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Florida
D.C. Docket No. 2:24-cv-14147-DMM

Before WILLIAM PRYOR, Chief Judge, and LAGOA and WILSON, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Anthony Lewis appeals the dismissal of his amended complaint against Lawnwood Hospital, a Florida hospital operated by

Hospital Corporation of America. The district court dismissed the complaint as a shotgun pleading and alternatively for failure to state a claim under federal and Florida law. Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). Because Lewis does not challenge the ruling that the amended complaint failed to state a claim for relief, we affirm.

I. BACKGROUND

Lewis’s complaint alleges events that arise out of his affiliation as a physician with Lawnwood Hospital. Lewis sued the hospital for retaliation, a hostile work environment, defamation, and breach of contract. He alleged that the hospital violated federal law when, after he complained of race-based discrimination, it subjected him to a series of “frivolous, unfounded ‘peer review’ investigations” that were racially motivated and failed to meet minimum federal standards. *See* 42 U.S.C. §§ 1101, 1981, 1983, 1985, 2000e-2. He also alleged that the hospital violated Florida law when it breached its bylaws by failing to provide adequate notice regarding the investigations and made “untruthful and slanderous comments” to his fellow physicians. These investigations culminated in the termination of his medical staff privileges. The district court explained that the complaint spanned “70 pages, with charts interspersed, and with numerous attachments,” contained allegations that were “redundant and include[d] references to statutes and facts . . . hav[ing] no apparent connection to his purported causes of action,” and contained facts that were “rambling, excessively long and at times incoherent.”

25-10386

Opinion of the Court

3

Lawnwood Hospital moved to dismiss the complaint. The district court ruled that the complaint did not satisfy federal pleading standards and constituted an impermissible shotgun pleading. It dismissed the complaint without prejudice and granted Lewis leave to file an amended complaint. Lewis filed an amended complaint, and Lawnwood Hospital moved to dismiss it, too. The district court determined that the amended complaint was “quite similar to the original” and that the “major difference” was that Lewis had transferred text from the body of the complaint to footnotes and not made “any meaningful effort to cure the defective complaint.” It ruled that the amended complaint remained an impermissible shotgun pleading and failed to state a claim for relief under federal and Florida law. It dismissed the amended complaint with prejudice.

II. STANDARDS OF REVIEW

“When a district court dismisses a complaint because it is a shotgun pleading, we review that decision for abuse of discretion.” *Barmapov v. Amuial*, 986 F.3d 1321, 1324 (11th Cir. 2021). When the district court also dismisses the complaint because it fails to state a claim, we review that decision *de novo* and accept the allegations of the complaint as true and construe them in the light most favorable to the plaintiff. *McCarthy v. City of Cordele*, 111 F.4th 1141, 1145 (11th Cir. 2024). When the district court interprets state law, we review that interpretation *de novo*. *Smith v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.*, 880 F.3d 1272, 1279 (11th Cir. 2018).

III. DISCUSSION

Lewis argues that his first amended complaint is not a shotgun pleading and that the district court violated his “First Amendment right of petition” and his “one-time right” to amend his first amended complaint. He presents no arguments to challenge the alternative ruling that his amended complaint also failed to state a claim for relief under federal and Florida law. So, we need not reach his former arguments because his failure to brief the latter issue is fatal to his appeal. *See Sapuppo v. Allstate Floridian Ins. Co.*, 739 F.3d 678, 680 (11th Cir. 2014) (“When an appellant fails to challenge properly on appeal one of the grounds on which the district court based its judgment, he is deemed to have abandoned any challenge of that ground, and it follows that the judgment is due to be affirmed.”).

Separately, Lewis asks us to reverse the order entered after the dismissal of his amended complaint, in which the district court sanctioned his counsel. Because review of that order exceeds the scope of this appeal—which is limited to the order dismissing Lewis’s amended complaint—and is the subject of another pending appeal in our Court, we do not reach his request.

IV. CONCLUSION

We **AFFIRM** the dismissal of Lewis’s amended complaint, **DENY** his motion to supplement the record, and **DENY** the parties’ competing motions for sanctions.

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT**

ELBERT PARR TUTTLE COURT OF APPEALS BUILDING
56 Forsyth Street, N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

David J. Smith
Clerk of Court

For rules and forms visit
www.ca11.uscourts.gov

October 30, 2025

MEMORANDUM TO COUNSEL OR PARTIES

Appeal Number: 25-10386-EE

Case Style: Anthony Lewis v. HCA Florida Lawnwood Hospital

District Court Docket No: 2:24-cv-14147-DMM

The enclosed order has been entered on petition(s) for rehearing.

See Rule 41, Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, and Eleventh Circuit Rule 41-1 for information regarding issuance and stay of mandate.

Clerk's Office Phone Numbers

General Information:	404-335-6100	Attorney Admissions:	404-335-6122
Case Administration:	404-335-6135	Capital Cases:	404-335-6200
CM/ECF Help Desk:	404-335-6125	Cases Set for Oral Argument:	404-335-6141

REHG-1 Ltr Order Petition Rehearing

In the
United States Court of Appeals
For the Eleventh Circuit

No. 25-10386

ANTHONY LEWIS, M.D.,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

HCA FLORIDA LAWNWOOD HOSPITAL,

Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Florida
D.C. Docket No. 2:24-cv-14147-DMM

ON PETITION FOR REHEARING AND PETITION FOR
REHEARING EN BANC

Before WILLIAM PRYOR, Chief Judge, LAGOA, and WILSON, Circuit
Judges.

PER CURIAM:

The Petition for Rehearing En Banc is DENIED, no judge in
regular active service on the Court having requested that the Court

2

Order of the Court

25-10386

be polled on rehearing en banc. FRAP 40. The Petition for Rehearing En Banc is also treated as a Petition for Rehearing before the panel and is DENIED. FRAP 40, 11th Cir. IOP 2.