

1 **WO**

2

3

4

5

6

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

7

FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

8

9

Robert Facciola, et al.,

) No. CV-10-1025-PHX-FJM

10

Plaintiffs,

) **ORDER**

11

vs.

12

Greenberg Traurig LLP, et al.,

13

Defendants.

14

15

16

17

We have before us Lead Plaintiffs’ motion for entry of final judgment (doc. 475). On June 9, 2011 we dismissed all of Lead Plaintiffs’ claims against Defendants Mayer Hoffman McCann, P.C., CBIZ, Inc., and CBIZ MHM, LLC (collectively, “MHM”) (doc. 200). On November 21, 2011, we denied Lead Plaintiffs’ leave to amend the complaint with respect to MHM (doc. 289). Subsequently, we approved class settlements and entered Rule 54(b) judgments in favor of Plaintiffs and against Defendants Quarles & Brady and Greenberg Traurig (docs. 473, 474). These orders, notwithstanding their Rule 54(b) designation, constitute “final judgments” for purposes of 28 U.S.C. § 1291.

25

Section 1291 provides for appellate review of “final decisions of the district courts.”

26

A final judgment is a decision by the district court that “ends the litigation on the merits and leaves nothing for the court to do but execute the judgment.” Catlin v. United States, 324 U.S. 229, 233, 65 S. Ct. 631, 633 (1945).

27

28

