

**Electronically Filed  
Intermediate Court of Appeals  
CAAP-14-0001321  
10-JUN-2015  
08:32 AM**

NO. CAAP-14-0001321

IN THE INTERMEDIATE COURT OF APPEALS  
OF THE STATE OF HAWAI'I

STANLEY S.L. KONG, Plaintiff-Appellant, v.  
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY, STATE OF HAWAI'I,  
Director Ted Sakai, in his individual and official capacity,  
Defendants-Appellees

APPEAL FROM THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIRST CIRCUIT  
(CIVIL NO. 14-1-1089-04)

ORDER DISMISSING APPEAL FOR LACK OF APPELLATE JURISDICTION  
(By: Foley, Presiding Judge, Leonard and Ginoza, JJ.)

Upon review of the record, it appears that we lack appellate jurisdiction over this appeal that Plaintiff-Appellant Stanley S.L. Kong (Appellant Kong) has asserted from the Honorable Edwin C. Nacino's November 10, 2014 interlocutory order denying Appellant Kong's request for entry of default, because the circuit court has not yet entered a separate final judgment as to all claims in Civil No. 14-1-1089-04 (ECN).

Hawaii Revised Statutes ("HRS") § 641-1(a) (1993 & Supp. 2014) authorizes appeals to the Hawai'i Intermediate Court of Appeals from final judgments, orders, or decrees. Appeals under HRS § 641-1 "shall be taken in the manner . . . provided by the rules of court." HRS § 641-1(c). Rule 58 of the Hawai'i Rules of Civil Procedure (HRCP) requires that "[e]very judgment shall be set forth on a separate document." The Supreme Court of Hawai'i has held that "[a]n appeal may be taken . . . only after the orders have been reduced to a judgment and the judgment has been entered in favor of and against the appropriate parties pursuant to HRCP [Rule] 58[.]" Jenkins v. Cades Schutte Fleming & Wright, 76 Hawai'i 115, 119, 869 P.2d 1334, 1338 (1994).

"Thus, based on Jenkins and HRCP Rule 58, an order is not appealable, even if it resolves all claims against the parties, until it has been reduced to a separate judgment." Carlisle v. One (1) Boat, 119 Hawai'i 245, 254, 195 P.3d 1177, 1186 (2008).

When interpreting the requirement under HRCP Rule 58 for a separate judgment document that, on its face, resolves all claims against all parties, the Supreme Court of Hawai'i noted that

[i]f we do not require a judgment that resolves on its face all of the issues in the case, the burden of searching the often voluminous circuit court record to verify assertions of jurisdiction is cast upon this court. Neither the parties nor counsel have a right to cast upon this court the burden of searching a voluminous record for evidence of finality, . . . and we should not make such searches necessary by allowing the parties the option of waiving the requirements of HRCP [Rule] 58.

Jenkins, 76 Hawai'i at 119, 869 P.2d at 1338 (original emphasis). Consequently, "[a]n appeal from an order that is not reduced to a judgment in favor or against the party by the time the record is

filed in the supreme court will be dismissed." Id. at 120, 869 P.2d at 1339 (footnote omitted).

On January 30, 2015, the circuit court clerk filed the record on appeal for appellate court case number CAAP-14-0001321, which does not include a final judgment. Although exceptions to the final judgment requirement exist under the doctrine in Forgay v. Conrad, 47 U.S. 201 (1848) (the Forgay doctrine), the collateral order doctrine, and HRS § 641-1(b) (1993 & Supp. 2014), the November 10, 2014 interlocutory order does not satisfy the requirements for appealability under the Forgay doctrine, the collateral order doctrine, or HRS § 641-1(b). See Ciesla v. Reddish, 78 Hawai'i 18, 20, 889 P.2d 702, 704 (1995) (regarding the two requirements for appealability under the Forgay doctrine); Abrams v. Cades, Schutte, Fleming & Wright, 88 Hawai'i 319, 322, 966 P.2d 631, 634 (1998) (regarding the three requirements for the collateral order doctrine); HRS § 641-1(b) (regarding the requirements for an appeal from an interlocutory order). Absent an appealable final judgment, we lack appellate jurisdiction. Thus, we must dismiss this appeal for lack of appellate jurisdiction.

[J]urisdiction is the base requirement for any court considering and resolving an appeal or original action. Appellate courts, upon determining that they lack jurisdiction shall not require anything other than a dismissal of the appeal or action. Without jurisdiction, a court is not in a position to consider the case further. Thus, appellate courts have an obligation to insure that they have jurisdiction to hear and determine each case. The lack of subject matter jurisdiction can never be waived by any party at any time. Accordingly, when we perceive a jurisdictional defect in an appeal, we must, sua sponte, dismiss that appeal.

Housing Fin. and Dev. Corp. v. Castle, 79 Hawai'i 64, 76, 898 P.2d 576, 588 (1995) (citation, internal quotation marks, and ellipsis points omitted; emphasis added).


NOT FOR PUBLICATION IN WEST'S HAWAII REPORTS AND PACIFIC REPORTER

Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that appellate court case number CAAP-14-0001321 is dismissed for lack of appellate jurisdiction.


DATED: Honolulu, Hawai'i, June 10, 2015.



Presiding Judge



Associate Judge



Associate Judge