

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
FLORIDA, TAMPA DIVISION

**In the Matter of the Complaint of Todd Rosenthal, as Owner, of the
2013 Everglades 243CC**

Rosenthal · No. 8:25-cv-2000-KKM-CPT · Decided February 18, 2026

SUMMARY

This document is a default judgment entered by the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida, Tampa Division, in an admiralty limitation-of-liability proceeding involving Todd Rosenthal and a 2013 Everglades 243CC vessel. The court entered final judgment by default, granting exoneration in favor of Rosenthal against potential claimants who failed to file claims or answers within the notice period. The document also includes standard information concerning attorney's fees, costs, and appellate deadlines.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida, Tampa Division
DECIDED	February 18, 2026
DOCKET	8:25-cv-2000-KKM-CPT
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Default judgment in an admiralty limitation-of-liability action after potential claimants failed to file claims or answers within the established notice period.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential

TOPICS

limitation of liability admiralty default judgment final judgment rule appellate procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

admiralty limitation of liability civil procedure appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the petitioner was entitled to final judgment by default against potential claimants who failed to file a claim or answer within the established notice period.

2. Whether the petitioner was entitled to exoneration from liability in the limitation-of-liability proceeding.

HOLDINGS

1. The court entered final judgment by default in favor of Todd Rosenthal and against all non-appearing potential claimants who failed to file a claim or answer within the established notice period.
2. The court awarded final judgment for exoneration by default in favor of Todd Rosenthal against the non-appearing potential claimants.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Final judgment for exoneration by default in favor of Todd Rosenthal and against all non- appearing potential claimants who failed to file a claim or answer within the established notice period.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Todd Rosenthal was the owner of the 2013 Everglades 243CC, identified by hull identification number RJDJ0224H213. He brought an admiralty action seeking exoneration from or limitation of liability. Potential claimants failed to file claims or answers within the court-established notice period.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Todd Rosenthal, as owner of the vessel 2013 Everglades 243CC, filed a complaint seeking exoneration from or limitation of liability. After notice was provided, potential claimants who failed to file a claim or answer within the established period were treated as non-appearing. The district court entered final judgment by default in favor of Rosenthal and against those non-appearing potential claimants.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Pitney Bowes, Inc. v. Mestre, 701 F.2d 1365, 1368 (11th Cir.)
- Williams v. Bishop, 732 F.2d 885, 885-86 (11th Cir.)
- Budinich v. Becton Dickinson & Co., 486 U.S. 196, 201, 108 S. Ct. 1717, 1721-22, 100 L. Ed. 2d 178 (1988)
- LaChance v. Duffy’s Draft House, Inc., 146 F.3d 832, 837 (11th Cir.)
- Cohen v. Beneficial Industrial Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541, 546, 69 S. Ct. 1221, 1225-26, 93 L. Ed. 1528 (1949)
- Atlantic Federal Savings & Loan Association v. Blythe Eastman Paine Webber, Inc., 890 F.2d 371, 376 (11th Cir.)
- Gillespie v. United States Steel Corp., 379 U.S. 148, 157, 85 S. Ct. 308, 312, 13 L. Ed. 2d 199 (1964)
- Rinaldo v. Corbett, 256 F.3d 1276, 1278 (11th Cir.)

OPINION

Rosenthal

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

TAMPA DIVISION

IN THE MATTER OF THE

COMPLAINT OF TODD

ROSENTHAL, as owner, of the 2013 Everglades 243CC (HIN: RJDJ0224H213), in a cause of exoneration from or limitation of liability Petitioner Case No.: 8:25-cv-2000-KKM-CPT

DEFAULT JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE

Decision by Court. This action came before the Court and a decision has been rendered.

IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED

Final judgment for exoneration by default in favor of Todd Rosenthal and against all non-appearing potential claimants who failed to file a claim or answer within the established notice period. Any motion seeking an award of attorney's fees or non-taxable costs must be filed within the time and in the manner prescribed in Local Rule 7.01, unless otherwise ordered by the Court.

Date: February 18, 2026

ELIZABETH M. WARREN,

CLERK

s/AL, Deputy Clerk (a) Appeals from final orders pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Section 1291: Only final orders and judgments of district courts, or final orders of bankruptcy courts which have been appealed to and fully resolved by a district court under 28 U.S.C. Section 158, generally are appealable. A final decision is one that “ends the litigation on the merits and leaves nothing for the court to do but execute the judgment.” *Pitney Bowes, Inc. V. Mestre*, 701 F.2d 1365, 1368 (11th Cir. 1983). A magistrate judge’s report and recommendation is not final and appealable until judgment thereon is entered by a district court judge. 28 U.S.C. Section 636(c). (b) In cases involving multiple parties or multiple claims, a judgment as to fewer than all parties or all claims is not a final, appealable decision unless the district court has certified the judgment for immediate review under Fed.R.Civ.P. 54(b), *Williams v. Bishop*, 732 F.2d 885, 885-86 (11th Cir. 1984). A judgment which resolves all issues except matters, such as attorneys’ fees and costs, that are collateral to the merits, is immediately appealable. *Budinich v. Becton Dickinson & Co.*, 486 U.S. 196, 201, 108 S. Ct. 1717, 1721-22, 100 L.Ed.2d 178 (1988); *LaChance v. Duffy’s Draft House, Inc.*, 146 F.3d 832, 837 (11th Cir. 1998). (c) Appeals pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Section 1292(a): Appeals are permitted from orders “granting, continuing, modifying, refusing or dissolving injunctions or refusing to dissolve or modify injunctions...” and from “[i]nterlocutory decrees...determining the rights and liabilities of parties to admiralty cases in which appeals from final decrees are allowed.” Interlocutory appeals from orders denying temporary restraining orders

are not permitted. (d) Appeals pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Section 1292(b) and Fed.R.App.P.5: The certification specified in 28 U.S.C. Section 1292(b) must be obtained before a petition for permission to appeal is filed in the Court of Appeals. The district court's denial of a motion for certification is not itself appealable. (e) Appeals pursuant to judicially created exceptions to the finality rule: Limited exceptions are discussed in cases including, but not limited to: *Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp.*, 337 U.S. 541, 546, 69 S.Ct. 1221, 1225-26, 93 L.Ed. 1528 (1949); *Atlantic Fed. Sav. & Loan Ass'n v. Blythe Eastman Paine Webber, Inc.*, 890 F.2d 371, 376 (11th Cir. 1989); *Gillespie v. United States Steel Corp.*, 379 U.S. 148, 157, 85 S. Ct. 308, 312, 13 L.Ed.2d 199 (1964).

2. Time for Filing: The timely filing of a notice of appeal is mandatory and jurisdictional. *Rinaldo v. Corbett*, 256 F.3d 1276, 1278 (11th Cir.

2001). In civil cases, Fed.R.App.P.4(a) and (c) set the following time limits: (a) Fed.R.App.P. 4(a)(1): A notice of appeal in compliance with the requirements set forth in Fed.R.App.P. 3 must be filed in the district court within 30 days after the entry of the order or judgment appealed from. However, if the United States or an officer or agency thereof is a party, the notice of appeal must be filed in the district court within 60 days after such entry. **THE NOTICE MUST BE RECEIVED AND FILED IN THE DISTRICT COURT NO LATER THAN THE LAST DAY OF THE APPEAL PERIOD** - no additional days are provided for mailing. Special filing provisions for inmates are discussed below. (b) Fed.R.App.P. 4(a)(3): "If one party timely files a notice of appeal, any other party may file a notice of appeal within 14 days after the date when the first notice was filed, or within the time otherwise prescribed by this Rule 4(a), whichever period ends later." (c) Fed.R.App.P.4(a)(4): If any party makes a timely motion in the district court under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure of a type specified in this rule, the time for appeal for all parties runs from the date of entry of the order disposing of the last such timely filed motion. (d) Fed.R.App.P.4(a)(5) and 4(a)(6): Under certain limited circumstances, the district court may extend the time to file a notice of appeal. Under Rule 4(a)(5), the time may be extended if a motion for an extension is filed within 30 days after expiration of the time otherwise provided to file a notice of appeal, upon a showing of excusable neglect or good cause. Under Rule 4(a)(6), the time may be extended if the district court finds upon motion that a party did not timely receive notice of the entry of the judgment or order, and that no party would be prejudiced by an extension. (e) Fed.R.App.P.4(c): If an inmate confined to an institution files a notice of appeal in either a civil case or a criminal case, the notice of appeal is timely if it is deposited in the institution's internal mail system on or before the last day for filing. Timely filing may be shown by a declaration in compliance with 28 U.S.C. Section 1746 or a notarized statement, either of which must set forth the date of deposit and state that first-class postage has been prepaid.

3. Format of the notice of appeal: Form 1, Appendix of Forms to the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, is a suitable format. See also

Fed.R.App.P. 3(c). A pro se notice of appeal must be signed by the appellant.

4. Effect of a notice of appeal: A district court loses jurisdiction (authority) to act after the filing of a timely notice of appeal, except for actions

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-middle-district-of-flor/2026/in-the-matter-of-the-complaint-of-todd-rosenthal-as-owner-e596qea0>