

IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

-----ooOoo-----

Joanne L. Stone,	)	MEMORANDUM DECISION	
	)	(Not For Official Publication)	
Petitioner and Appellee,	)		
	)	Case No. 20070932-CA	
v.	)		
	)	F I L E D	
Todd L. Stone,	)	(January 22, 2010)	
	)		
Respondent and Appellant.	)	<table border="1"><tr><td>2010 UT App 7</td></tr></table>	2010 UT App 7
2010 UT App 7			

-----

Third District, Salt Lake Department, 014903655  
The Honorable Tyrone E. Medley

Attorneys: Todd L. Stone, Salt Lake City, Appellant Pro Se

-----

Before Judges Davis, Thorne, and Voros.

PER CURIAM:

Todd L. Stone purports to appeal the district court's minute entry of October 19, 2007.<sup>1</sup> We dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction.

This court does not have jurisdiction to consider an appeal unless it is taken from a final judgment or order or qualifies for an exception to the final judgment rule. See Loffredo v. Holt, 2001 UT 97, ¶¶ 10, 15, 37 P.3d 1070. An order is final only if it disposes of the case as to all parties and "finally dispose[s] of the subject-matter of the litigation on the merits of the case." Bradbury v. Valencia, 2000 UT 50, ¶ 9, 5 P.3d 649 (internal quotation marks omitted).

Mr. Stone seeks review of the district court's October 19, 2007 minute entry. However, the minute entry required counsel

---

1. Due to the entry of numerous post-judgment orders, which were independently appealable, including one entered on October 24, 2007, this court believed that it may have had jurisdiction over at least some of the issues asserted by Mr. Stone in his appeal. However, after reviewing his brief, it appears that all of the issues Mr. Stone raised are related to either the October 19, 2007 minute entry or other previous orders of the district court.

for Joanne L. Stone to prepare an order consistent with the ruling. It does not appear that any such order was ever submitted to the court. Accordingly, the minute entry did not end the controversy between the parties. See State v. Leatherbury, 2003 UT 2, ¶ 9, 65 P.3d 1180 (noting that a minute entry was not a final order where further action was contemplated by the express language of the order, which required counsel to prepare findings). Therefore, the October 19, 2007 minute entry was not a final, appealable order, and we lack jurisdiction to resolve the issues associated with that minute entry. See Bradbury, 2000 UT 50, ¶ 9. When this court lacks jurisdiction, it must dismiss the appeal. See Loffredo, 2001 UT 97, ¶ 11.

The appeal is dismissed without prejudice to the filing of a timely appeal after the district court enters a final, appealable order.<sup>2</sup>

---

James Z. Davis,  
Presiding Judge

---

William A. Thorne Jr., Judge

---

J. Frederic Voros Jr., Judge

---

2. The court notes for the benefit of the parties that when filing briefs with this court, a pro se litigant, like a litigant represented by counsel, must comply with rule 24 of the Utah Rules of Appellate Procedure. This means that such a party must, among other things, cite to the record, i.e., the sequential numbers stamped on the bottom of each page, and provide legal citations to support each of his claims. See Utah R. App. P. 24(a). Failure to comply with these requirements can result in the rejection of a brief and the dismissal of an appeal. See id. R. 24(k).