# In the Missouri Court of Appeals
# Eastern District

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| SABRINA J. HOEPER, | ) | No. ED111840 |
| | ) | |
| Respondent, | ) | |
| | ) | |
| vs. | ) | |
| | ) | |
| JAMES P. HOEPER, | ) | |
| | ) | |
| Appellant. | ) | |

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

Appellant has filed a notice of appeal and the legal file. Appellant purports to appeal from a June 23, 2023 order granting Respondent's motion to dismiss Appellant's motion for sanctions.

Rule 74.01(a) provides that a judgment is entered "when a writing signed by the judge and denominated 'judgment' or 'decree' is filed." Here, both the document attached to the notice of appeal and in the legal file filed by Appellant contain a copy of Respondent's motion to dismiss Appellant's motion for sanctions with the trial court's "So Ordered" stamp. However, this is not a judgment complying with Rule 74.01(a).

In addition, for a judgment to be appealable, it must be one that finally disposes of at least one claim on the merits and not a ruling on miscellaneous issues that does not resolve even one claim. See, Gibson v. Brewer, 952 S.W.2d 239, 244 (Mo. banc 1997). A motion for sanctions is not a "claim for relief" as contemplated by Rule 74.01(b). Klein v. Clinton, 456 S.W.3d 80, 84 (Mo. App. S.D. 2015). Here, the trial court's June 23, 2023 order does not appear to be a final, appealable judgment.

Appellant is directed to show cause on or before August 10, 2023, why this appeal should not be dismissed for lack of a final, appealable judgment.

SO ORDERED.

DATED: 7-21-23

Kelly C. Broniec, Chief Judge

ecc: Laura Stobie
William Eckelkamp

Not an Official Court Document