

NOTE: This order is nonprecedential.

**United States Court of Appeals
for the Federal Circuit**

MORRIS REESE,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

T-MOBILE USA, INC.,
Defendant-Appellee.

2014-1519

Appeal from the United States District Court for the
Central District of California in No. 2:13-cv-05199-ODW,
Judge Otis D. Wright, II.

MORRIS REESE,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

AT&T MOBILITY II LLC,
Defendant-Appellee.

2014-1520

2

REESE v. T-MOBILE USA, INC.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the
Central District of California in No. 2:13-cv-05198-ODW,
Judge Otis D. Wright, II.

MORRIS REESE,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

**CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A VERIZON
WIRELESS,**
Defendant-Appellee.

2014-1522

Appeal from the United States District Court for the
Central District of California in No. 2:13-cv-05197-ODW,
Judge Otis D. Wright, II.

MORRIS REESE,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

TRACFONE WIRELESS, INC.,
Defendant-Appellee.

2014-1523

REESE v. T-MOBILE USA, INC.

3

Appeal from the United States District Court for the
Central District of California in No. 2:13-cv-05196-ODW,
Judge Otis D. Wright, II.

MORRIS REESE,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

SPRINT-NEXTEL CORPORATION,
Defendant-Appellee.

2014-1524

Appeal from the United States District Court for the
Central District of California in No. 2:13-cv-03811-ODW,
Judge Otis D. Wright, II.

ON MOTION

Before REYNA, BRYSON, and WALLACH, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM.

O R D E R

In these related appeals, Morris Reese seeks interlocutory review of orders of the District Court for the Central District of California granting summary judgment and holding that the doctrine of laches barred the underlying complaints. Because these appeals are premature, we grant appellees' motions to dismiss.

In response to Mr. Reese's separate charges of patent infringement, several of the defendants filed counterclaims, seeking declaratory judgment of non-infringement, patent invalidity, and inequitable conduct. After the district court granted the defendants' motions for summary judgment, he directed the parties to file a joint status report detailing what issues remain for the court to resolve. Mr. Reese then filed motions for reconsideration of the summary judgment orders, which remain pending.

Section 1295(a)(1) of Title 28 authorizes this court to review "a final decision" of a district court in a patent infringement case, *i.e.*, a decision that "ends the litigation on the merits and leaves nothing for the court to do but execute the judgment." *Van Cauwenberghe v. Biard*, 486 U.S. 517, 521-22 (1988) (quoting *Catlin v. United States*, 324 U.S. 229, 233 (1945)). That has not yet occurred in this case. The district court was clear that the summary judgment orders did not call an end to the litigation, and Mr. Reese's motions for reconsideration and the defendants' counterclaims are still unadjudicated. Thus, Mr. Reese's notices of appeal were clearly premature.

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

- (1) The motions to dismiss are granted.
- (2) Each side shall bear its own costs.

FOR THE COURT

/s/ Daniel E. O'Toole
Daniel E. O'Toole
Clerk of Court

s19

ISSUED AS A MANDATE: July 25, 2014