

United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

No. 25-11343
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

October 19, 2026

Thomas B. Plunkett, III
Clerk

EFFRIN REYNA,

Plaintiff—Appellant,

versus

BRYAN THOMPSON, *Judge of Brown County*; JOEL KELTON,
Commissioner, Precinct #2; JIMMY CORNELIUS, *Former Officer*; C. J.
GOVER, *Officer,*

Defendants—Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Texas
USDC No. 6:25-CV-59

Before JONES, HO, and WILSON, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:*

On March 21, 2021, Effrin Reyna was allegedly arrested with excessive force by two police officers of Brown County, Texas. Reyna claims that, during this arrest, the officers “held [him] down with a cuff on [his] arm behind [his] back, one officer on each leg, one subduing [him] with Jim

* This opinion is not designated for publication. *See* 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.

No. 25-11343

Cornelius' foot crushing [his] throat as C.J. Gover shot [him] for the 2nd time.” Reyna alleges that he was unable to swallow after the incident, but he did not receive medical treatment.

On July 14, 2025, Reyna filed a Section 1983 action to recover for these injuries in the Northern District of Texas. His complaint named Officers Grover and Cornelius, Police Commissioner Joel Kelton, as well as Brown County Judge Bryan Thompson. Reyna alleged \$10,000,000 in damages. The defendants moved to dismiss for failure to state a claim, invoking Texas's two-year statute of limitations for personal injury suits. A magistrate judge, in a thorough and well-reasoned order, recommended that Reyna's claims are time barred. *See Balle v. Nueces Cty., Texas*, 952 F.3d 552, 556 (5th Cir. 2017) (citing Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code Ann. § 16.003(a)). Reyna submitted putative responses and objections, as well as an amended complaint, but these filings did not address the statute of limitations. Thus, the district judge adopted the recommendation and dismissed the case with prejudice.

On appeal, Reyna asserts further vagaries about his encounter with the police, as well as new claims of constitutional violations, including under the Emoluments Clause. But we do not consider evidence or arguments not presented to the district court. *Little v. Liquid Air Corp.*, 37 F.3d 1069, 1071 n.1 (5th Cir.1994). Moreover, Reyna does not identify any errors in the district court's analysis of the dispositive time-bar issue. There are none.

Having carefully considered the briefs, the district court's opinion, and pertinent portions of the record, we find no reversible error. We therefore AFFIRM the judgment of the district court essentially for the reasons stated.