

NOT PRECEDENTIAL

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 24-3297

INDIGO INVESTMENT GROUP

v.

TONY DEROSA-GRUND; SONJA E. DEROSA-GRUND,
Appellants

On Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of New Jersey
(D.C. Civil Action No. 3:22-cv-05498)
District Judge: Honorable Georgette Castner

Submitted Pursuant to Third Circuit L.A.R. 34.1(a)
March 18, 2026

Before: HARDIMAN, FREEMAN, and ROTH, *Circuit Judges*

(Opinion filed: October 22, 2026)

OPINION*

* This disposition is not an opinion of the full Court and pursuant to I.O.P. 5.7 does not constitute binding precedent.

PER CURIAM

In 2022, Indigo Investment Group (“Appellee”) brought a civil diversity action in the District Court against Tony and Sonja DeRosa-Grund (“Appellants”), raising numerous claims. The parties subsequently notified the District Court that they had reached a settlement. The District Court then dismissed the case with prejudice but retained jurisdiction over the settlement “until the obligations provided for therein have been met and completed.” Dist. Ct. Order entered June 29, 2023, at 2.

Appellee later moved the District Court to enforce the settlement, arguing that Appellants had failed to comply with its terms. Appellants, proceeding pro se, opposed that motion, moved to vacate the settlement and the District Court’s dismissal order pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b), and moved to compel arbitration of the case’s merits. On December 5, 2024, the District Court entered an omnibus order that granted Appellee’s motion to enforce the settlement, denied Appellants’ Rule 60(b) motion, and denied as moot their motion to compel arbitration. This timely appeal followed.¹

¹ We have jurisdiction over this appeal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1291. In assessing the District Court’s decision to enforce the settlement agreement, we exercise plenary review over the District Court’s legal conclusions and review its factual findings for clear error. *See Coltec Indus., Inc. v. Hobgood*, 280 F.3d 262, 269 (3d Cir. 2002). We review the District Court’s denial of Appellants’ Rule 60(b) motion for abuse of discretion, exercising de novo review over the District Court’s legal conclusions and reviewing its factual findings for clear error. *See Herrera v. Agents of Pa. Bd. of Prob. & Parole*, 132 F.4th 248, 254 n.5 (3d Cir. 2025). And we exercise plenary review over the District Court’s denial of Appellants’ motion to compel arbitration. *See Young v. Experian Info. Sols.*, 119 F.4th 314, 318 n.7 (3d Cir. 2024).

The District Court, in a 15-page opinion accompanying its December 5, 2024 order, carefully and cogently explained its decision to enforce the parties’ settlement and deny Appellants’ efforts to undo it. For substantially the reasons set forth in that opinion, we see no reason to disturb the District Court’s decision. Accordingly, we will affirm that judgment.²

² To the extent that Appellee seeks to supplement the appendix with material from the District Court record, that request is granted. Appellants’ motion to seal their appellate filings that contain personal medical information — information that has no bearing on the outcome of this appeal — is granted, too. All other requests for relief made by the parties in this appeal are denied.