SILVIA DIEGO, DEV GNANADEV, REGINALD LOW, DENISE PINES, JANET SALOMONSON, GERRIE SCHIPSKE, DAVID SERRANO

SEWELL, BARBARA YAROSLAYSKY, In Their Official Capacities

as Members of the Medical

27

28

Doc. 69

Board of California,

Defendants.

----00000----

On December 3, 2012, the court enjoined defendants from enforcing Senate Bill 1172 ("SB 1172") against plaintiffs Donald Welch, Anthony Duk, and Aaron Bitzer, and defendants appealed the order granting the preliminary injunction on January 1, 2013. The Ninth Circuit has set an expedited briefing schedule and the appeal is set to be heard the week of April 15, 2013, along with the appeal in the case of <u>Pickup v. Brown</u>, Civ. No. 2:12-2497 KJM EFB.¹ Defendants now seek a stay of the case pending resolution of that appeal.

After considering the parties' arguments in their briefs along with the interests served in staying the case, the court finds that granting defendants' motion for a stay will be fair to all parties as well as serve the interests of judicial economy. Cf. Leyva v. Certified Grocers of Cal., Ltd., 593 F.2d 857, 863-64 (9th Cir. 1979) ("A trial court may, with propriety, find it is efficient for its own docket and the fairest course for the parties to enter a stay of an action before it, pending

On January 29, 2013, Judge Mueller granted the parties' joint request for a stay pending resolution of the appeal in Pickup v. Brown. See Pickup v. Brown, Civ. No. 2:12-2497 KJM EFB, Docket No. 98 ("[T]here is no indication that a stay pending resolution of the preliminary injunction appeal would harm any of the parties, especially because they have jointly requested the stay. Moreover, because the preliminary injunction appeal will resolve issues related to the constitutionality of SB 1172 that this court will need to address in order to move forward, it will achieve efficiencies to await the outcome of the Ninth Circuit proceedings.").

resolution of independent proceedings which bear upon the case."). It is expected that the appeal will resolve an issue that is central to this case in which two judges of this court reached differing conclusions, namely, whether it is likely that SB 1172 violates the First Amendment. As the court in this action enjoined defendants from enforcing SB 1172 against plaintiffs, and the Ninth Circuit enjoined enforcement of SB 1172 pending resolution of the appeal in Pickup, plaintiffs here will not suffer harm in waiting for a decision from the Ninth Circuit before continuing to litigate this action.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that defendants' motion for a stay be, and the same hereby is, GRANTED. All proceedings in this action are hereby STAYED pending the appeal in <u>Pickup v. Brown</u>, Civ. No. 2:12-2497 KJM EFB. The hearing previously set for February 11, 2013, at 2:00 p.m. is VACATED. Upon resolution of the pending appeal, counsel shall take the necessary steps to inform the Clerk and arrange to have this matter set for further status conference.

DATED: February 6, 2013

WILLIAM B. SHUBB

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE