COURT OF APPEALS OF VIRGINIA

Present: Judges Elder, Bray and Annunziata Argued by teleconference

ANTHONY A. SANCHEZ

v. Record No. 1577-01-4

MEMORANDUM OPINION* BY JUDGE RICHARD S. BRAY APRIL 16, 2002

MELANIE SANCHEZ

FROM THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA Alfred D. Swersky, Judge

Anthony A. Sanchez, pro se.

No brief or argument for appellee.

Anthony A. Sanchez (father) appeals an order of the trial court denying his motion to compel Melanie Sanchez (mother) to participate in the binding arbitration of child custody, care and maintenance issues. On appeal, he argues the trial court erroneously disregarded two previous orders of the court and refused to enforce a provision of the parties' "Settlement Agreement" mandating submission of "disagreement[s]" to "mediation, which . . . shall be binding " Because father's argument is procedurally barred, we affirm the order.

The parties are fully conversant with the record, and this memorandum opinion recites only those facts necessary to a disposition of the appeal.

^{*} Pursuant to Code § 17.1-413, this opinion is not designated for publication.

It is well established that "[n]o ruling of the trial court . . . will be considered as a basis for reversal unless the objection was stated together with the grounds therefor at the time of the ruling, except for good cause shown or to enable the Court of Appeals to attain the ends of justice " Rule 5A:18; see Lee v. Lee, 12 Va. App. 512, 515-16, 404 S.E.2d 736, 737-38 (1991) (en banc).

The order on appeal was endorsed by father as "Seen and Agreed," clearly evincing no objection to the attendant ruling. Father does not assert "good cause" or "the ends of justice" exceptions to Rule 5A:18, and the record does not otherwise compel review by this Court. See Mounce v. Commonwealth, 4 Va. App. 433, 436, 357 S.E.2d 742, 744 (1987).

Accordingly, Rule 5A:18 precludes consideration of the issue on appeal, and we affirm the trial court.

Affirmed.