

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

FILED  
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
MAY 22 2006  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
BY DEPUTY

Priority  
Send  
Enter  
Closed  
JS-5/JS-6  
JS-2/JS-3  
Scan Only  
SCANNED

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JOANNE SIEGEL & LAURA )  
SIEGEL LARSON, )  
Plaintiffs )  
v. )  
TIME WARNER, INC., )  
et al., )  
Defendants. )

CV 04-8776 RSWL (RZx)

ORDER  
THIS CONSTITUTES NOTICE OF ENTRY  
AS REQUIRED BY FRCP, RULE 77(d).

ENTERED  
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
MAY 23 2006  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
BY DEPUTY

Defendants Motion to Certify this Court's Order for Immediate Appeal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b) on calendar for May 22, 2006 was taken under submission. No appearances by counsel are necessary.

This Court has considered all of the papers and

93

RECORDED  
SERIALIZED

1 argument submitted on the matter and **NOW FINDS AND RULES AS**  
2 **FOLLOWS:**

3  
4 The general rule is that an appellate court should not  
5 review a ruling from a district court until after entry of  
6 final judgment. Coopers & Lybrand v. Livesay, 437 U.S. 463,  
7 474 (1978).

8  
9 An exception to this general rule appears in 28 U.S.C.  
10 § 1292, which provides that certification of an  
11 interlocutory order for appeal is appropriate when the order  
12 involves a controlling question of law, as to which there is  
13 substantial ground for difference of opinion, and where a  
14 resolution thereof will materially advance the termination  
15 of the litigation. 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b).

16  
17 However, Congressional legislative history "indicates  
18 that [interlocutory appeal] was to be used only in  
19 extraordinary cases where decision of an interlocutory  
20 appeal might avoid protracted and expensive litigation. It  
21 was not intended merely to provide review of difficult  
22 rulings in hard cases." United States Rubber Co. v. Wright,  
23 359 F.2d 784, 785 (9th Cir. 1966).

24  
25 This Court finds that this case is not one of the  
26 extraordinary cases contemplated by 28 U.S.C. §1292, nor

SCANNED

1 does the application of the statute's requirements to the  
2 facts of this case support certifying the Order for  
3 immediate appeal.

4  
5 Therefore, Defendants' Motion to Certify this Court's  
6 Order for Immediate Appeal is **DENIED**.

7  
8 **IT IS SO ORDERED.** *RONALD S. W LEW*

9  
10 RONALD S.W. LEW  
11 United States District Judge

12 DATE: *May 22, 2006*

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26