

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-1300

GERTRUDE CORETTA FENNELL HAMILTON,

Debtor – Appellant,

v.

U.S. BANK NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, U.S. Bank National Association As
Legal Title Trustee for RMTP Trust, Series 2021 BKM-TT-V; RUSHMORE
SERVICING; MICHELLE R. GHIDOTTI-GONSALVES, Esq.; MEREDITH
COKER, Esq.; RUSHMORE LOAN MANAGEMENT SERVICES, LLC; BRIAN
CAMPBELL, Esq.; ANNE MARIE THRONE, Esq.; PHH MORTGAGE
SERVICES; JASON WYMAN, Esq.; GENTRY COLLINS, Esq.; TRAVIS MENK,
Esq.; OCWEN LOAN SERVICING, LLC,

Creditors – Appellees,

and

JAMES M. WYMAN,

Trustee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at
Charleston. Richard Mark Gergel, District Judge. (2:24-cv-05918-RMG-MHC)

Submitted: November 25, 2025

Decided: December 1, 2025

Before WYNN and RICHARDSON, Circuit Judges, and KEENAN, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Gertrude Coretta Fennell Hamilton, Appellant Pro Se. Diana C. Theologou,
MCMICHAEL TAYLOR GRAY, LLC, Peachtree Corners, Georgia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Gertrude Coretta Fennell Hamilton seeks to appeal the district court's order denying her motion to reassign her case and affirming the magistrate judge's order denying her motions for a stay pending appeal. This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291, and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292; Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); *Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp.*, 337 U.S. 541, 545-46 (1949). The order Hamilton seeks to appeal is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. *See In re Va. Elec. & Power Co.*, 539 F.2d 357, 364 (4th Cir. 1976) (holding that denial of a motion to disqualify is not a final and appealable order); *In re Atencio*, 913 F.2d 814, 817 (10th Cir. 1990) ("When a district court, acting in its appellate capacity, denies a stay of a bankruptcy order pending appeal, the court of appeals lacks jurisdiction to review that interlocutory order under [28 U.S.C.] § 1292(a)."). Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED