

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

In the
United States Court of Appeals
For the Eleventh Circuit

No. 25-12673
Non-Argument Calendar

ILLOOMINATE MEDIA, INC.,
A Florida Corporation,

Plaintiff,

LAURA LOOMER,
A Florida Individual,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

CAIR FLORIDA, INC.,
A Florida Corporation,
CAIR FOUNDATION,
A District of Columbia Corporation,
TWITTER, INC.,
A Delaware Corporation,
JOHN DOES 1-5,
CRAIG W YOUNG,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Florida
D.C. Docket No. 9:19-cv-81179-RAR

Before BRANCH, LUCK, and LAGOA, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Laura Loomer, pro se, appeals from the district court's July 29, 2025 postjudgment order affirming a magistrate judge's ruling. As relevant background, the defendants filed a motion to compel Loomer and another plaintiff to comply with a settlement agreement the parties executed in 2023. The defendants also requested that the district court hold the plaintiffs in contempt and impose sanctions. The magistrate judge granted the motion, in part, and directed the plaintiffs to comply with the settlement agreement. However, the magistrate judge took under advisement the defendants' requests for contempt and sanctions. The district court's July 29, 2025 order affirmed the magistrate judge's decision without ruling on contempt or sanctions. After Loomer appealed, the plaintiffs filed a notice of compliance with the July 29, 2025 order and the magistrate judge ruling it affirmed.

We asked the parties to address whether we have jurisdiction to review the July 29 order. Only the appellees responded, and they contend that we lack jurisdiction.

Upon review of the record and that response, we conclude that we lack jurisdiction over Loomer's appeal because it is not taken from a final or otherwise appealable order. *See* 28 U.S.C.

25-12673

Opinion of the Court

3

§ 1291 (providing that appellate jurisdiction is generally limited to “final decisions of the district courts”); *id.* § 1292 (providing jurisdiction to review certain interlocutory orders). The July 29, 2025 order is not final because it did not resolve the defendants’ requests for contempt and sanctions. *See Mayer v. Wall St. Equity Grp., Inc.*, 672 F.3d 1222, 1224 (11th Cir. 2012) (providing that a postjudgment order is final when it disposes of all the issues raised in the motion that initiated the postjudgment proceedings); *Mamma Mia’s Trattoria, Inc. v. Original Brooklyn Water Bagel Co.*, 768 F.3d 1320, 1324-25 (11th Cir. 2014) (holding that a postjudgment order related to the enforcement of a permanent injunction is not final unless it involves contempt or sanctions). Furthermore, the order is not appealable as an interlocutory ruling on injunctive relief because it merely interpreted an existing settlement agreement. *See Mamma Mia’s Trattoria, Inc.*, 768 F.3d at 1326-27 (explaining that an order interpreting an existing injunction is not subject to immediate appeal).

Accordingly, this appeal is DISMISSED for lack of jurisdiction.