

UNREPORTED  
IN THE APPELLATE COURT  
OF MARYLAND

No. 1938

September Term, 2024

---

NOBLE WILLIAMS AJEBON

v.

BRENNAN FERGUSON, *et al.*

---

Wells, C.J.,  
Friedman,  
Woodward, Patrick L.  
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

---

PER CURIAM

---

Filed: August 6, 2025

\*This is a per curiam opinion. Under Rule 1-104, the opinion is not precedent within the rule of stare decisis nor may it be cited as persuasive authority.

In June 2024, appellees,<sup>1</sup> the substitute trustees, filed an Order to Docket in the Circuit Court for Prince George’s County seeking to foreclose on real property owned by Noble Ajebon, appellant. The parties participated in a foreclosure mediation on November 8, 2024, but no agreement was reached. On November 26, 2024, the court entered an order stating that it had received a report from the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) indicating that the mediation had not resulted in an agreement and therefore, that appellees could “schedule the foreclosure sale, subject to the right of the borrower to file a motion pursuant to Rule 14-211 to stay the sale and dismiss the action.” Appellant now appeals from that order raising a single issue: whether he was “wrongfully [] rejected” for a loan modification by his lender. Appellees disagree, and have moved to dismiss the appeal as not allowed by law. For the reasons that follow, we shall grant the motion to dismiss.

With limited exceptions, an appeal may be taken only from a final judgment. Md. Code Ann., Courts and Judicial Proceedings § 12-301 (1974, 2020 Repl. Vol.). To constitute a final judgment, the trial court’s determination must either decide and conclude the rights of the parties involved or deny a party the means to prosecute or defend rights and interests in the subject matter of the proceeding. *Nnoli v. Nnoli*, 389 Md. 315, 324 (2005) (citing *Rohrbeck v. Rohrbeck*, 318 Md. 28, 41 (1989)). We look to whether any future order was to be issued or whether any further action was to be taken in a case to determine whether an order or ruling is a final appealable judgment. *Id.* There are three limited exceptions to the final judgment rule under which interlocutory orders may be

---

<sup>1</sup> Appellees are Brennan Ferguson, Amanda Driscole, John C. Hanrahan, Paul Heinmuller, Robert Oliveri, and Jeremy B. Wilkins.

appealed in Maryland: (1) appeals from interlocutory orders specifically allowed by statute; (2) immediate appeals permitted under Maryland Rule 2-602; and (3) appeals from interlocutory rulings allowed under the common law collateral order doctrine. *Salvagno v. Frew*, 388 Md. 605, 615 (2005).

Neither the OAH report documenting the unsuccessful mediation, nor the court's order allowing the foreclosure sale to proceed constitute a final judgment because the foreclosure sale has not yet occurred or been ratified.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, they do not meet the criteria for an appealable interlocutory order. Consequently, the appeal must be dismissed.

**APPELLEES' MOTION TO DISMISS  
APPEAL GRANTED. COSTS TO BE  
PAID BY APPELLANT.**

---

<sup>2</sup> In fact, as the circuit court noted in its order, appellant may still challenge appellees' right to foreclose by filing a Rule 14-211 motion to stay or dismiss the foreclosure action.