

Slip Copy, 2006 WL 1049092 (D.Utah)
(Cite as: Slip Copy)

Briefs and Other Related Documents

Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.
United States District Court, D. Utah, Central
Division.

Trent SOWSONICUT, et al., Plaintiffs,
v.
ROOSEVELT CITY, et al., Defendants.
No. 2:03-CV-676.

April 5, 2006.

Brett C. Painter, Nathalie A. Bleuze, Thomas P. Johnson, Davis Graham & Stubbs LLP, Denver, CO, Wade R. Budge, Snell & Wilmer, Salt Lake City, UT, for Plaintiffs.

Meb W. Anderson, Peter Stirba, Stirba & Associates, Gary R. Guelker, Jenson Stavros & Guelker, Salt Lake City, UT, for Defendants.

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER
BENSON, J.

*1 Before the Court is Plaintiffs' motion for entry of a final judgment, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(b), on claims dismissed by the Court's order granting Defendants' motion for partial summary judgment. In its order, the Court dismissed all but one of Plaintiffs' 42 U.S.C. section 1983 claims against the City of Roosevelt, the Roosevelt City Police Department ("RCPD"), and three individual RCPD officers. The Court dismissed the claims of Cheryl Gardner, Daysha Sowsonicut, Wendellena Navanick, Samantha Ankerpont, Angelo Checora, and Angelyn Caren. The lone remaining claim is Trent Sowsonicut's section 1983 claim against RCPD Officer Henry McKenna for his alleged use of excessive force. The Court, having considered the parties' briefs and relevant law, DENIES Plaintiffs' motion.

The Court, under rule 54(b), has discretion to enter a final judgment as to the claims dismissed by its previous order granting partial summary judgment

in favor of Defendants. See *Curtiss-Wright Corp. v. Gen. Elec. Co.*, 446 U.S. 1, 8, 100 S.Ct. 1460, 64 L.Ed.2d 1 (1980) ("It is left to the sound judicial discretion of the district court to determine the 'appropriate time' when each final decision in a multiple claim action is ready for appeal."). Rule 54(b) provides:

When more than one claim for relief is presented in an action ... or when multiple parties are involved, the court may direct the entry of a final judgment as to one or more but fewer than all of the claims or parties only upon an express determination that there is no just reason for delay and upon an express direction for the entry of judgment.

Fed.R.Civ.P. 54(b). "The purpose of [r]ule 54(b) 'is to avoid the possible injustice of a delay in entering judgment on a distinctly separate claim or as to fewer than all of the parties until the final adjudication of the entire case by making an immediate appeal available.'" *Okla. Turnpike Auth. v. Bruner*, 259 F.3d 1236, 1241 (10th Cir.2001) (citation omitted). Rule 54(b) is also intended to preserve "the historic federal policy against piecemeal appeals." *Id.* The rule, therefore, "attempts to strike a balance between the undesirability of more than one appeal in a single action and the need for making review available in multiple-party or multiple-claim situations at a time that best serves the needs of the litigants." *Id.* Trial courts, however, "should be reluctant to enter [r]ule 54(b) orders," and the "power which this [r]ule confers upon the trial judge should be used only in the infrequent harsh case as an instrument for the improved administration of justice and the more satisfactory disposition of litigation in the light of the public policy indicated by statute and rule." *Gas-A-Car, Inc. v. Am. Petrofina, Inc.*, 484 F.2d 1102, 1105 (10th Cir.1973) (quotations and citation omitted). Rule 54(b) "is not intended to provide a mechanism for splitting multiple claims into separate lawsuits." *Jordan v. Pugh*, 425 F.3d 820, 830 (10th Cir.2005).

Slip Copy, 2006 WL 1049092 (D.Utah)
(Cite as: Slip Copy)

*2 Certification under rule 54(b) is appropriate only when the Court strictly adheres to the rule's requirements and establishes the following prerequisites: (1) the case involves either multiple claims for relief or multiple parties, (2) at least one claim or the rights and liabilities of at least one party must be finally decided, and (3) the Court finds that there is no just reason for delaying an appeal. *See Jordan*, 425 F.3d at 826. "While the exact definition of 'claim' for purposes of [r]ule 54(b) is unsettled, a 'claim' is generally understood to include all factually or legally connected elements of a case." *Bruner*, 259 F.3d at 1242. And an order is considered "final" if it is "an ultimate disposition of an individual claim entered in the course of a multiple claim action." *Id.* (citation omitted).

Even assuming that Trent's excessive force claim is separable from those claims dismissed by the Court's grant of partial summary judgment and that the Court's order constitutes a final decision, rule 54(b) nonetheless requires the Court to make an express determination that there is no just reason for delay. *See id.*; *see also Curtiss-Wright Corp.*, 446 U.S. at 8 ("Not all final judgments on individual claims should be immediately appealable, even if they are in some sense separable from the remaining unresolved claims.").

For several reasons, the Court finds that there is just reason for the delay of Plaintiffs' appeal until the Court reaches a final decision with regard to Plaintiffs' remaining claim. First, there is factual overlap between the events surrounding Trent and Cheryl's dismissed claims and Trent's remaining excessive force claim. Trent's claim that Officer McKenna used excessive force in effectuating his arrest arises from the same encounter in which Trent and Cheryl unsuccessfully claimed that they were illegally searched and seized. Were the Court to grant Plaintiffs' request for an immediate appeal of their dismissed claims, judicial efficiency would be hindered, as the appellate court may need to familiarize itself with the facts of this case more than once. *See Bruner*, 259 F.3d at 1241; *see also* 10 Charles Alan Wright & Arthur R. Miller, *Federal Practice and Procedure: Civil 3d* § 2656 (2005) (stating that the close relationship between

the fact patterns supporting claims "means that the policy against piecemeal review with the attendant risk of repeated inquiry into the same basic facts should take precedence over the desirability of permitting an immediate appeal upon termination of a separable unit of the case").

Second, Trent's remaining claim presents a legal issue similar to Angelo's dismissed claim. Both claims assert that RCPD officers used excessive force, during separate encounters, in arresting Trent and Angelo. In determining whether separate appeals will be redundant, the Court should consider whether the separate claims "involve common legal issues." *Jordan*, 425 F.3d at 827.

*3 Furthermore, the Court finds that the equities involved do not merit an immediate appeal. Defendant McKenna would unnecessarily be required to simultaneously defend himself on appeal and before this Court.

Finally, the Court "also must take into account the possible impact of an immediate appeal on the remaining trial proceedings." 10 Wright & Miller, *Federal Practice and Procedure* § 2656. The Court should consider "whether the appeal will have the undesirable effect of delaying the trial of the unadjudicated matter[] without gaining any offsetting advantage in terms of the simplification and facilitation of that trial." *Id.* The Court determines that certification of Plaintiffs' dismissed claims would not facilitate or simplify Plaintiffs' remaining claim. *See Curtiss-Wright Corp.*, 446 U.S. at 8 ("[A] district court must take into account judicial administrative interests as well as the equities involved.").

For the reasons stated above, Plaintiffs' motion is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 4th day of April, 2005.

D.Utah,2006.
Sowsonicut v. Roosevelt City
Slip Copy, 2006 WL 1049092 (D.Utah)

Slip Copy, 2006 WL 1049092 (D.Utah)
(Cite as: Slip Copy)

Briefs and Other Related Documents (Back to top)

- 2006 WL 1285583 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Reply Brief in Support of Motion for Entry of Final Judgment on Claims Dismissed by Order Granting Partial Summary Judgment (Mar. 21, 2006) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- 2006 WL 1285584 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Reply Brief in Support of Motion for Entry of Final Judgment on Claims Dismissed By Order Granting Partial Summary Judgment (Mar. 21, 2006) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- 2005 WL 3489706 () Opposition to Defendants' Daubert Motion in Limine to Exclude or Limit the Testimony of Plaintiffs' Expert Witness Dr. Larry A. Gould, and Reply in Support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Leave to Supplement (Aug. 11, 2005) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- 2005 WL 2041102 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Memorandum in Support of Defendants' Daubert Motion in Limine to Exclude or Limit the Testimony of Plaintiffs' Expert Witness Larry A. Gould, and in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Leave to Supplement, and Reply in Support of Defendants' Motion to Strike Expert Report. (Jul. 12, 2005)
- 2005 WL 2041100 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Strike Expert Report (Jun. 28, 2005)
- 2005 WL 2041099 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Reply Memorandum in Support of Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and in Support of Defendants' Motion to Strike Expert Report (May 31, 2005)
- 2005 WL 2041096 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Memorandum in Support of Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (Apr. 8, 2005)
- 2005 WL 2041094 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Plaintiffs' Response to Memorandum in Support of Defendants' Motion to Strike Plaintiffs' Supplemental Responses to Interrogatory No. 9 (Mar. 28, 2005)
- 2005 WL 2041093 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Plaintiffs' Response to Supplemental Memorandum in Support of Defendants' Motion to Strike Plaintiffs' Supplemental Initial Disclosures Re: Damages (Feb. 16, 2005)
- 2005 WL 2041092 (Trial Motion, Memorandum

- and Affidavit) Supplemental Memorandum in Support Defendants' Motion to Strike Plaintiffs' Supplemental Initial Disclosures re Damages (Feb. 4, 2005)
- 2004 WL 3489789 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Plaintiffs' Reply in Support of Motion to Compel Responses to Discovery Requests (Sep. 23, 2004)
- 2004 WL 3489785 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendants' Reply Memorandum in Support of Motion to Strike Plaintiffs' Supplemental Initial Disclosures re Damages (Sep. 22, 2004)
- 2004 WL 3489781 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendants' Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Responses to Discovery Requests (Sep. 16, 2004)
- 2004 WL 3489777 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendants' Memorandum in Support of Motion to Strike Plaintiffs' Supplemental Initial Disclosures re Damages (Aug. 25, 2004)
- 2004 WL 3489770 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Responses to Discovery Requests and Supporting Brief (Aug. 24, 2004)
- 2004 WL 3489773 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Reply in Support of Motion to Compel Disclosure of Personnel Records and youth Detention Records (Aug. 24, 2004)
- 2004 WL 3489768 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendants' Memorandum in Opposition to Motion to Compel Disclosure of Personnel Records and Youth Detention Records (Aug. 23, 2004)
- 2004 WL 3489766 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Reply Memorandum in Support of Motion to Compel (Jan. 27, 2004)
- 2004 WL 3489763 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Plaintiffs' Reply in Support of Motion for Entry of a Protective Order and Response to Cross Motion to Compel (Jan. 21, 2004)
- 2004 WL 3489761 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendants' Opposition to Motion for Entry of a Protective Order and Cross-Motion and Memorandum to Compel (Jan. 9, 2004)
- 2003 WL 24142121 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Plaintiffs' Motion for Entry of a Protective Order and Supporting Memorandum (Dec. 30, 2003)

Slip Copy, 2006 WL 1049092 (D.Utah)
(Cite as: Slip Copy)

- 2003 WL 24142116 (Trial Pleading) Answer of Defendants Roosevelt City, Roosevelt City Police Department, Steve Hooley, Henry Mckenna and Lance Williamson and Demand for Jury (Sep. 19, 2003)
- 2003 WL 24142107 (Trial Pleading) Complaint (Jul. 31, 2003)
- 2:03cv00676 (Docket) (Jul. 31, 2003)

END OF DOCUMENT