

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-1622

JOHN RODGERS BURNLEY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

ALEXANDRA M. VALENTIN; JEFFREY W. WALBURN; ROBERT BONO;
BRITTANY BONO; ANDREW JOSEPH NASH; MORGAN CHRISTINE NASH;
JORDON L. NIERMEYER; MARY C. NIERMEYER; DONALD DAVENPORT,
Commander City of Richmond, Virginia (Fourth Precinct); MARGARET
CUNNINGHAM, Detective City of Richmond, Virginia Police Department,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

FLAGSTAR BANK, FSB; USAA FEDERAL SAVINGS BANK; QUICKEN
LOANS INC.; VIRGINIA CREDIT UNION, INC.; RICHARD G. EDWARDS,
Chief of Police City of Richmond, Virginia; ANN-FRANCES LAMBERT,
Councilwoman for the City of Richmond (3rd District); CYNTHIA I. NEWBILLE,
President for the Richmond City Council; ELLEN F. ROBERTSON, Vice President
for the Richmond City Council; LEVAR STONEY, Mayor for the City of
Richmond, Virginia; UNKNOWN NAMED POLICE OFFICERS FOR THE CITY
OF RICHMOND, VIRGINIA; CITY OF RICHMOND, Municipality; INTERNAL
AFFAIRS DIVISION FOR THE CITY OF RICHMOND POLICE
DEPARTMENT,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at
Richmond. Roderick Charles Young, District Judge. (3:23-cv-00160-RCY)

Submitted: November 20, 2025

Decided: November 24, 2025

Before THACKER, HARRIS, and QUATTLEBAUM, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

John Rodgers Burnley, Appellant Pro Se. John Ryan Owen, HARMAN CLAYTOR CORRIGAN & WELLMAN, Glen Allen, Virginia; Shannan Marie Fitzgerald, OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

John Rodgers Burnley seeks to appeal the magistrate judge's order directing Burnley to respond to Defendants' respective motions to enforce a settlement agreement. 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 Burnley seeks to appeal is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. 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