

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
VIRGINIA, ROANOKE DIVISION**

Vincent Woodhouse v. Major King

Woodhouse · No. 7:20-cv-00655 · Decided June 5, 2026

OPINION

CLERE'S OFFICE U.S. DIST. CC AT HARRISONBURG, VA IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT me FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA Tune 09, 2026 ROANOKE DIVISION LAURA A. AUSTIN, □ □ □ □ BY: S/J.Vasquez VINCENT WOODHOUSE,) DEPUTY CLERK) Plaintiff,) Case No. 7:20-cv-00655) v.) MEMORANDUM OPINION) MAJOR KING,) By: Hon. Thomas T. Cullen) United States District Judge Defendant.!) Plaintiff Vincent Woodhouse, initially proceeding pro se, filed this action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

(See Compl.) After counsel for Woodhouse entered their appearances, this matter proceeded to trial where a jury returned a verdict for Woodhouse. (ECF No. 122.) Subsequently, the parties, including Woodhouse (represented by counsel), entered into a settlement agreement resolving this matter (ECF No. 141-2) and jointly moved to vacate the jury's verdict. (ECF No. 138.)

In granting the motion to vacate, the court retained jurisdiction over this matter to enforce the terms of the settlement agreement. (ECF No. 139 at 1.). On October 20, 2025, Woodhouse executed a pro se motion to enforce the settlement agreement (ECF No. 141), which is pending before the court. Woodhouse claims that Defendants? have breached the settlement agreement in a variety of ways.

(See zd.) Defendants filed a response in opposition (ECF No. 142), Woodhouse did not file a reply, and the motion is ripe for adjudication. ' Woodhouse initially sued three Defendants: Major King, Joseph Ely, and Unit Manager Stallard. (See Compl. at 1 [ECF No. 1].) But his claims against Ely and Stallard were dismissed on summary judgment. (See ECF No. 34.)

2 In addition to Woodhouse and King, the Virginia Department of Corrections was a party to the settlement agreement. (ECF No. 141-2 at 1.) Counsel for Woodhouse has not moved to withdraw as counsel of record, and there is no indication that Woodhouse is no longer represented. "A district court has no obligation to entertain pro se motions filed by a represented party." *Abdullah v. United States*, 240 F.3d 683, 686 (8th Cir.

2001); *Mitchell v. Senkowski*, 489 F. Supp. 2d 147, 150 (N.D.N.Y. 2006) ("[T]his Court will not accept Plaintiff's pro se filing in this civil matter as the substantive motion standing alone, and with Plaintiff represented by counsel."); see also *United States v. Hammond*, 821 F. App'x 203,

207 (4th Cir. 2020) (noting that district courts are generally under no obligation to consider pro se motions filed by represented parties).

Accordingly, Woodhouse's motion (ECF No. 141) will be denied without prejudice. If Woodhouse still intends to seek relief based on alleged breaches of the settlement agreement, he may do so through counsel or upon a showing that he is no longer represented by counsel.

The Clerk is directed to forward a copy of this Memorandum Opinion and the accompanying Order to the parties. ENTERED this 5th day of June, 2026. /s/ Thomas T. Cullen HON. THOMAS T. CULLEN UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE