

United States Court of Appeals
For the Eighth Circuit

No. 25-1467

Matthew Harmann

Plaintiff - Appellee

v.

James Martin Arganbright, in his individual capacity, also known as Marty;
Jeremy Bennett, in his individual capacity

Defendants - Appellants

Dana Minter, in her individual capacity

Defendant

Appeal from United States District Court
for the Southern District of Iowa - Central

Submitted: October 27, 2025

Filed: October 30, 2025

[Unpublished]

Before SMITH, GRUENDER, and STRAS, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

James Arganbright and Jeremy Bennett appeal the district court's¹ interlocutory order denying in part their motion to dismiss based on qualified immunity in Matthew Harmann's retaliation-related civil rights action. After careful review, we conclude that the district court properly denied the motion to dismiss as to the 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claims and the state retaliation claims. *See Stanley v. Finnegan*, 899 F.3d 623, 625 (8th Cir. 2018) (stating an interlocutory order denying a motion to dismiss § 1983 claims based on qualified immunity is immediately appealable); *Galanakis v. City of Newton*, 134 F.4th 998, 1006 (8th Cir. 2025) (discussing when this court has pendent jurisdiction over state claims in an interlocutory appeal); *Faulk v. City of St. Louis*, 30 F.4th 739, 744 (8th Cir. 2022) (discussing the standard of review on the denial of qualified immunity under § 1983); Iowa Code § 80F.1(15), (16) (prohibiting retaliation against officers for engaging in political activity).

As to the district court's ruling on Harmann's state claim related to the release of confidential information, we conclude that we lack jurisdiction, as the issues are not inextricably intertwined with his section 1983 claims. *See Galanakis*, 134 F.4th at 1006. Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal as to the district court's ruling on that claim, and otherwise affirm.

¹The Honorable Stephen H. Locher, United States District Judge for the Southern District of Iowa.