

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

-----oo0oo-----

MOHIT RANDHAWA aka HARPAL SINGH,
and SHANNON CALLNET PVT LTD, NO. CIV. 2:09-2304 WBS KJN

Plaintiffs,

ORDER

v.

SKYLUX INC., INTERACTIVE
INTELLIGENCE, INC., MUJEEB
PUZHAKKARAILLATH, SKYLUX
TELELINK PVT LTD, and DOES 1
through 20, inclusive,

Defendants.

-----oo0oo-----

Plaintiffs Mohit Randhawa aka Harpal Singh and Shannon
Callnet Pvt. Ltd. ("Shannon Callnet") filed this action against
defendants Interactive Intelligence, Inc. ("Interactive"),
Skylux, Inc., Mujeeb Puzhakkaraillath, and Skylux Telelink Pvt.
Ltd. (the latter three collectively "Skylux defendants"),
alleging state law claims arising from contracts for an India-
based calling center and software. On October 18, 2010, the
court stayed all claims against Interactive, which are subject to

1 arbitration, and all claims against the Skylux defendants, which
2 are not subject to arbitration. (Docket No. 102.) In June of
3 2011, the court continued a Status Conference set for June 27,
4 2011, to December 12, 2011, and ordered the parties to file a
5 joint status report no later than two weeks before the
6 conference. (Docket No. 116.)


7 Only Interactive has filed a status report. (Docket
8 No. 117.) According to that report, an initial prehearing
9 conference was held with the arbitrator on October 12, 2011.
10 (Id. ¶ 8.) At the conference, Shannon Callnet was instructed to
11 file an amended complaint with the arbitrator by November 11,
12 2011, and a timeline for the arbitration was set. Interactive
13 proposes that the court continue the stay and set another status
14 conference six months from now. (Id. ¶ 9.)

15 Interactive's status report does not give an estimate
16 of when arbitration proceedings will conclude. This action has
17 already been stayed for over a year and the arbitration
18 proceeding is only now commencing. As it appears that the action
19 will be in arbitration for the foreseeable future, this case
20 shall be ordered administratively closed. See Dees v. Billy, 394
21 F.3d 1290, 1294 (9th Cir. 2005) ("[T]he 'effect of an
22 administrative closure is no different from a simple stay, except
23 that it affects the count of active cases pending on the court's
24 docket; i.e., administratively closed cases are not counted as
25 active.'" (discussing and quoting Mire v. Full Spectrum Lending
26 Inc., 389 F.3d 163, 167 (5th Cir. 2004))).

27 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that all proceedings in this
28 matter shall be STAYED. The currently pending motion filing

1 deadline and pretrial conference and trial dates are hereby
2 vacated. The Clerk of Court is instructed to administratively
3 close this case, to be reopened upon request and application of
4 the parties and order of this court.

5 DATED: December 9, 2011

6
7 

8 WILLIAM B. SHUBB

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28