1	
2	
3	
4	
5	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
7	
8	CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER) RESOURCES,) 2:05-cv-0518-GEB-EFB
9) Plaintiff,)
10) <u>ORDER</u> * v.)
11) POWEREX CORPORATION,)
12) Defendant.)
13	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
14	On September 9, 2011, Plaintiff California Department of Water
15	Resources ("CDWR") filed a "Motion to Confirm End of Stay or, in the
16	Alternative, to Lift Stay ("motion"), arguing FERC has adjudicated three
17	pertinent filings. (Pl.'s Mot., 2:1-4.) This case was stayed in an order
18	filed September 4, 2009, during the Federal Energy Regulatory
19	Commission's ("FERC") adjudication of FERC filings referenced in the

20 stay order. Defendant Powerex Corporation ("Powerex") opposes the 21 motion and argues FERC is still adjudicating issues that bear directly 22 on this case. (Def.'s Opp'n ("Opp'n"), 1:12-2:2.)

CDWR requested rehearings on the three FERC filings that CDWR argues have been adjudicated. (Mot., 5:11-12.) This evinces that CDWR is still actively seeking relief from FERC that bears on issues in this case.

27

^{28 *} This matter is deemed suitable for decision without oral argument. E.D. Cal. R. 230(g).

1	Powerex's argument that two other proceedings at FERC
2	necessitate the stay has not been shown to be within the scope of CDWR's
3	Motion and is an argument that is not properly decided in light of the
4	motion CDWR noticed for hearing. Therefore, the merits of this argument
5	are not reached.
6	Since CDWR has not shown that the stay should be lifted,
7	CDWR's motion is denied.
8	Dated: October 7, 2011
9	A 115 2 MI
10	GARLAND E. BURREIL, JR.
11	United States District Judge
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17 18	
10	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	