

IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

-----ooOoo-----

In the matter of the adoption of T.B., an infant.)	MEMORANDUM DECISION
_____)	(Not For Official Publication)
)	Case No. 20080657-CA
T.M.,)	
)	F I L E D
Appellant,)	(September 18, 2008)
)	
v.)	2008 UT App 339
)	
B.B. and S.B.,)	
)	
Appellees.)	

Second District, Ogden Department, 072900020
The Honorable Roger S. Dutson

Attorneys: Daniel S. Drage and Michael J. Boyle, Ogden, for
Appellant
Larry S. Jenkins and Lance D. Rich, Salt Lake City,
for Appellees

Before Judges Thorne, Bench, and Orme.

PER CURIAM:

T.M. (Father) appeals the district court's ruling denying his motion to set aside the adoption of T.B., Father's biological child. This is before the court on its own motion for summary disposition based on lack of jurisdiction due to the absence of a final order.

Generally, appeals may be taken only from final orders. See Bradbury v. Valencia, 2000 UT 50, ¶ 9, 5 P.3d 649. Father filed a notice of appeal from the trial court's ruling, which denied his motion and expressly directed Father to prepare an order consistent with the ruling. Where a ruling directs further action, it is not a final order susceptible to enforcement. See State v. Leatherbury, 2003 UT 2, ¶ 9, 65 P.3d 1180. Because the ruling appealed here directed further action, it is not a final order. As a result, this court lacks jurisdiction and must dismiss the appeal. See Bradbury, 2000 UT 50, ¶ 8.

Accordingly, this appeal is dismissed without prejudice to the filing of a timely notice of appeal after the entry of a final order.

William A. Thorne Jr.,
Associate Presiding Judge

Russell W. Bench, Judge

Gregory K. Orme, Judge