

*Ingeiaol Clan v. ROP*, 8 ROP Intrm. 311 (2001)  
**INGEIAOL CLAN, Represented By SANTOS OLIKONG**  
**Appellant,**

v.

**REPUBLIC OF PALAU,**  
**Appellee.**

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 01-09  
Civil Action No. 01-12

Supreme Court, Appellate Division  
Republic of Palau

Decided: April 24, 2001

Counsel for Appellant: Pro Se

Counsel for Appellee: Daniel M. Pacheco, Assistant Attorney General

BEFORE: ARTHUR NGIRAKLSONG, Chief Justice; LARRY W. MILLER, Associate Justice;  
KATHLEEN M. SALII, Associate Justice.

PER CURIAM:

The notice of appeal in this matter seeks review of a decision of the trial court granting appellee's motion to intervene. Since "[w]e have long adhered to the premise that the proper time to consider appeals is after final judgment," *ROP v. Black Micro Corp.*, 7 ROP Intrm. 46, 47 (1998); accord *Kuniyoshi Fishing Co. v. ROP*, 8 ROP Intrm. 49 (1999), appellant was ordered to show cause why the appeal should not be dismissed as interlocutory.<sup>1</sup>

Appellant has duly responded, acknowledging that its appeal is interlocutory, 1312 but arguing that appellee is violating Article XIII, Section 10, of the Constitution by claiming public land that it is required to return to its original owners, and urging that, unless the appeal is heard now, appellant will have to expend additional time and money in prosecuting its claim.

We express no view on the ultimate question whether appellee is a proper party to this case, but note that there are numerous other claimants to the land at issue against which appellant will have to put forward its own claim irrespective of appellee's participation in the matter. But whether or not proceeding with this appeal might be more efficient in this particular case – as to which we are, at best, uncertain – we adhere to our previously-expressed view that, as a general matter, "[p]iecemeal appeals disrupt the trial process, extend the time required to litigate a case, and burden appellate courts." *ROP v. Black Micro Corp.*, 7 ROP Intrm. 46, 47 (1998)

---

<sup>1</sup> Appellee subsequently filed a motion to dismiss on the same ground.

*Ingeiaol Clan v. ROP*, 8 ROP Intrm. 311 (2001)  
The appeal is accordingly DISMISSED.