OPINION SUMMARY

MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS EASTERN DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

JOANNE PUETZ-ANDERSON, et al.,	)	No. ED108772
	)	
Respondents,	)	Appeal from the Circuit Court
	)	of St. Louis County
vs.	)	16SL-CC03837
	)	
GERALD B. PUETZ, et al.,	)	Honorable Richard M. Stewart
	)	
Appellants.	)	Filed: July 13, 2021

Gerald B. Puetz, Jeanette M. Puetz, and David M. Puetz ("Appellants"), acting pro se, appeal a judgment entered by the Circuit Court of St. Louis County in accordance with a consent agreement ("Consent Judgment") between Appellants and Joanne Puetz-Anderson and James E. Puetz ("Respondents"), resolving Respondents' petition for partition of real estate. Respondents have filed a motion to dismiss the appeal, arguing the Consent Judgment may not be appealed except for the purpose of challenging the trial court's subject matter jurisdiction. This Court took the motion with the case.

APPEAL DISMISSED.

Division One Holds: We grant Respondents' motion to dismiss the appeal referred to above.[1] Consent judgments are not appealable except for the purpose of challenging the trial court's subject matter jurisdiction. The trial court here had subject matter jurisdiction over the action, and thus there is no basis for challenging the Consent Judgment and the appeal must be dismissed.

Opinion by: Robert M. Clayton III, J
Colleen Dolan, P.J., and Kelly C. Broniec, J., concur.

Attorney for Appellants: David, M. Puetz, Pro Se, and Jeannette M. Puetz, Pro Se
Attorney for Respondents: Peter P. Fiore, Jr.
Attorney for Defendant: Canice T. Rice, Jr.

THIS SUMMARY IS NOT PART OF THE OPINION OF THE COURT. IT HAS BEEN PREPARED FOR THE CONVENIENCE OF THE READER AND SHOULD NOT BE QUOTED OR CITED.

[1] Respondents also filed a second motion to dismiss, an objection to Appellants' motion to accept Appellants' brief, and a motion to strike Appellants' appendix, which were taken with the case. Because we dismiss the appeal on other grounds, these motions and pleadings are rendered moot.