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.

23

24

25

26

27

28

Section 1291 provides for appellate review of "final decisions of the district courts." 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).

The filing of the final judgments against Greenberg and Quarles finally disposed of the entire case on its merits and left nothing pending before this court. Therefore, these judgments constitute the "final judgment" for purposes of 28 U.S.C. § 1291. Once we entered these final judgments, our earlier interlocutory orders, including the orders granting MHM's motion to dismiss and denying Plaintiffs' motion to amend with respect to MHM, merged into the final judgment and became reviewable on appeal. American Ironworks & Erectors Inc. v. North Am. Constr. Corp., 248 F.3d 892, 897-98 (9th Cir. 2001). There is no need to enter a separate final judgment with respect to our interlocutory orders, including those dismissing other defendants. Id. at 898.

Therefore, **IT IS ORDERED DENYING** as most Lead Plaintiffs' motion for entry of final judgment (doc. 475). In the event that Lead Plaintiffs intend to appeal our decisions with respect to MHM, they may wish to seek leave to extend the time to file a notice of appeal pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(5)(A).

DATED this 15th day of November, 2012.

Frederick J. Martone United States District Judge