APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS AND ORDERS

Per Curiam Opinion, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit (June 8, 2026) 1a

Order Denying Post-Judgment Review, U.S. District Court for the Western District of Missouri (April 14, 2026) 3a

Order Denying Motion to Amend and Recuse/Reassign Judge, U.S. District Court for the Western District of Missouri (September 3, 2025) 8a

Order Granting Motions to Dismiss, U.S. District Court for the Western District of Missouri (August 8, 2025) 12a

REHEARING ORDER

Order Denying Petition for Rehearing En Banc, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit (July 15, 2026) 28a

STATUTORY PROVISION

29 U.S.C. § 1133 ..... 29a

OTHER DOCUMENTS

Bert Bell/Pete Rozelle NFL Player Retirement Plan, Sections 5.7 and 11.7 ..... 30a

Athlete Longitudinal Evidence Translation Framework (ALETF) 32a

PER CURIAM OPINION, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT (JUNE 8, 2026)

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

CHRISTOPHER MARTIN,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

NFL DISABILITY PLAN; NFL RETIREMENT PLAN; MICHAEL B. MILLER, PLAN DIRECTOR; GABRIELLA BROWN, SENIOR COORDINATOR - PLAYER BENEFITS; ANITA MARTIN; LEGAL REPRESENTATIVES OF ANITA MARTIN; COLIN M. QUINN; LEWANNA BELL LLOYD; JUDGE KRISHNAN CHRISTOPHER JAYARAM; JUDGE CHRISTINA DUNN GYLLENBORG; LEONARD MATH; MARY R. WYATT; TAMMY PARROTT,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 25-2984

Submitted: June 3, 2026
Filed: June 8, 2026
[Unpublished]

Appeal from United States District Court
for the Western District of Missouri - Kansas City

Before: GRUENDER, KELLY, and KOBES, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM

Christopher Martin appeals after the district court[1] dismissed his civil action, challenging only the resolution of his Employment Retirement Income Security Act claim, which the district court concluded was time-barred. After careful review of the record and the parties' arguments on appeal, we find no basis for reversal. *See Humphrey v. Eureka Gardens Pub. Facility Bd.*, 891 F.3d 1079, 1081 (8th Cir. 2018) (reviewing de novo grant of Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss claim as time barred). Accordingly, we affirm, and we deny the pending motions. *See* 8th Cir. R. 47B.

---

[1] The Honorable Howard Sachs, United States District Judge for the Western District of Missouri.

ORDER DENYING POST-JUDGMENT REVIEW, U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI (APRIL 14, 2026)

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI WESTERN DIVISION

CHRISTOPHER MARTIN,

Plaintiff,

v.

NFL DISABILITY PLAN, ET AL.,

Defendants.

Case No. 4:25-cv-00100-RK

Before: Roseann A. KETCHMARK, United States District Judge.

ORDER

Pro se Plaintiff Christopher Martin filed this case alleging mishandling of his benefits accrued while working for the National Football League ("NFL") as well as his 2006 divorce proceedings. Now before the Court are three post-judgment motions filed by Plaintiff: (1) a motion for relief from judgment pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(2), (Doc. 94); (2) "Consolidated Post-Judgment Motion for Relief Under Rule 60(b)(2) and Request for Indicative

Ruling Under Rule 62.1(a)(3)," (Doc. 98); and (3) "Notice of New Evidence and Submission of Complete (11/18/2025) NFL Administrative Denial Appeal Package," (Doc. 99). After careful consideration and for the reasons stated below, Plaintiff's motions are DENIED.

DISCUSSION

Plaintiff brought a myriad of claims against many defendants. The instant motions only concern Plaintiff's claim for wrongful denial of his 2008 claim for total and permanent disability benefits under the NFL retirement plan brought pursuant to the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 ("ERISA"). Plaintiff alleged the claim against the NFL Disability & Survivor Benefit Plan ("Disability Plan"); the Bert Bell/Pete Rozelle NFL Player Retirement Plan ("Retirement Plan"); Michael B. Miller; Gabriella Brown; and Tammy Parrott (collectively, the "NFL Player Plan Defendants"). Numerous motions to dismiss were filed, including by the NFL Player Plan Defendants on March 21, 2025. (Doc. 17.) On August 8, 2025, the Court dismissed all of Plaintiff's claims against all defendants.[1] (Doc. 78.) With respect to Plaintiff's claim for wrongful denial of benefits by the NFL Player Plan Defendants, Plaintiff had not administratively exhausted his claim under the NFL Player Plan and the claim was time barred.[2] (*Id.* at 8-9.)

---

[1] The case was originally assigned to the Honorable Howard F. Sachs. The case was reassigned by administrative transfer on December 31, 2025. (Doc. 95.)

[2] Unrelated to this ERISA claim, Plaintiff applied for Social Security Disability Insurance ("SSDI") benefits on December 5, 2022. Plaintiff submitted an unsigned April 2025 letter addressed to the Social Security Administration ("SSA") related to this

Plaintiff filed a motion to alter or amend the judgment pursuant to Rule 59(e) which was denied on September 3, 2025. (Doc. 88.) Finally, on October 3, 2025, Plaintiff filed a notice of appeal from the Court's August 8 and September 3, 2025, Orders. (Doc. 91.) That appeal remains pending.[3] (8th Cir. Case No. 25-2984.)

On October 20, 2025, the SSA determined that Plaintiff was disabled for purposes of the Social Security Act, with an onset date of January 5, 2005. (Doc. 99 at 17.) Accordingly, Plaintiff was awarded federal social security benefits.

After Plaintiff initiated his appeal, he filed the instant motions seeking relief under Rule 60(b)(2). The Court addresses the three motions together, as each motion raises the same argument which is that the SSA's October 20, 2025, determination finding Plaintiff disabled under the Social Security Act[4] is

---

application for SSDI benefits. The Court acknowledged Plaintiff's reliance on the letter, but found that even if the letter established that the SSA had determined Plaintiff was disabled, that determination would not entitle Plaintiff to benefits under the NFL Player Plan because the plan expressly precludes total and permanent benefits in Plaintiff's situation; moreover, SSA determinations are not binding on plan administrators under ERISA.

[3] Ordinarily, the filing of a notice of appeal divests the Court's jurisdiction of aspects of the case involved in the appeal. *Hunter v. Underwood*, 362 F.3d 468, 475 (8th Cir. 2004). The Court may, however, consider a motion pursuant to Rule 60(b) "on the merits and deny it even if an appeal is already pending" before the Court of Appeals. *Id.*

[4] After Plaintiff's SSDI application was approved, Plaintiff completed another application for total and permanent disability benefits under the NFL Player Plan on October 31, 2025. The