

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 21-1807**

---

MICHAEL STAR,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

THE WAREHOUSE BAR AND GRILLE; HOUSSEIN PRICHARD; PRASERT  
RAUMATHONG; TSEGAYE TEDESSE; PEPE VASQUEZ,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at  
Alexandria. John Foster Anderson, Magistrate Judge. (1:20-cv-00950-JFA)

---

Submitted: May 26, 2022

Decided: June 29, 2022

---

Before WYNN and QUATTLEBAUM, Circuit Judges, and FLOYD, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Michael Star, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Michael Star seeks to appeal the district court's\* interlocutory orders granting in part Appellees' motion for sanctions and reaffirming on reconsideration the imposition of sanctions under Fed. R. Civ. P. 37. We are obliged to inquire into our own jurisdiction, even when the parties do not dispute it. *Williamson v. Stirling*, 912 F.3d 154, 168 (4th Cir. 2018). We 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 orders Star seeks to appeal are neither final orders nor appealable interlocutory or collateral orders. *See In re Underwriters at Lloyd's*, 666 F.2d 55, 58 (4th Cir. 1981) (per curiam). Although the district court granted Star's motion to voluntarily dismiss the action without prejudice, we adhere to "the long-settled principle that . . . no appeal lies from a judgment of voluntary nonsuit." *Keena v. Groupon, Inc.*, 886 F.3d 360, 365 (4th Cir. 2018) (internal quotation marks omitted); *see also Affinity Living Grp., LLC v. StarStone Specialty Ins. Co.*, 959 F.3d 634, 637-39 (4th Cir. 2020) (discussing appellate jurisdiction over interlocutory orders following voluntary dismissal). Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately

---

\* The parties consented to proceed before a magistrate judge. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(c).

presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

*DISMISSED*