

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF  
INDIANA, SOUTH BEND DIVISION

Ronell L. Roberts v. Warden

Roberts · No. 3:24-CV-208-PPS-JEM · Decided December 23, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana denied Ronell L. Roberts’s second motion for relief under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b). The court held that the motion, which sought reconsideration of the dismissal of his untimely habeas petition based on equitable tolling, was governed by Rule 60(b)(1) or (2) and was filed more than one year after the judgment, making it untimely.

CASE DETAILS

|                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| COURT                 | United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana, South Bend Division                                                                                                                                                           |
| WRITING FOR THE COURT | Philip P. Simon                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| JURISDICTION          | United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana, South Bend Division                                                                                                                                                           |
| DECIDED               | December 23, 2025                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| DOCKET                | 3:24-CV-208-PPS-JEM                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| DISPOSITION           | dismissed                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| PROCEDURAL POSTURE    | Petitioner filed a second motion under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b) seeking relief from the order dismissing his habeas petition as untimely and asking the court to reconsider its prior rulings concerning equitable tolling.         |
| STANDARD OF REVIEW    | A Rule 60(b) motion must be filed within a reasonable time, and motions based on Rule 60(b)(1), (2), or (3) must be filed no more than one year after entry of the judgment or order. The court may not extend that deadline under Rule 6(b)(2). |
| PRECEDENTIAL VALUE    | unpublished                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| PARTIES               | Ronell L. Roberts v. Warden                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |

TOPICS

federal habeas corpus

motion for reconsideration

post-conviction relief

statute of limitations

civil procedure

## PRACTICE AREAS

federal habeas corpus

post-conviction relief

civil procedure

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Roberts's second Rule 60(b) motion was subject to the one-year deadline applicable to motions under Rule 60(b)(1) or (2).
2. Whether the court could extend the Rule 60(b) deadline or grant relief under Rule 60(b)(6) despite the motion's untimeliness.

## HOLDINGS

1. Because Roberts's motion was most fairly characterized as arising under Rule 60(b)(1) or Rule 60(b)(2), it was subject to Rule 60(c)(1)'s one-year filing deadline.
2. The court lacked authority to extend the applicable Rule 60(b) deadline, and Roberts's motion, filed more than seven months late, had to be denied as untimely.

## KEY QUOTATIONS

*“Accordingly, [courts] have held that the first three clauses of Rule 60(b) and the catchall clause are mutually exclusive.”*

*“Because Roberts filed this motion more than seven months too late, I deny this motion as untimely.”*

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Roberts is a prisoner who filed a habeas petition that the court dismissed as untimely under 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d). He later sought equitable tolling based on limited access to the law library and filed a second Rule 60(b) motion offering additional detail in support of that argument more than one year after the original dismissal.

## PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court dismissed Roberts's habeas petition on May 1, 2024, as untimely under 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d), also finding that his actual-innocence assertion did not satisfy *Schlup v. Delo*. Roberts filed a first Rule 60(b) motion on November 4, 2024, which the court denied on November 6, 2024. He filed the present second Rule 60(b) motion on December 19, 2025; the court denied it as untimely.

## DISPOSITION

dismissed

## CASES CITED

- Arrieta v. Battaglia, 461 F.3d 861, 865 (7th Cir. 2006)
- Schlup v. Delo, 513 U.S. 298, 327-29 (1995)

---

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-northern-district-of-in/2025/ronell-l-roberts-v-warden-110uskg0>