1		
1		
2		
3 4		
4 5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STAT	ES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
9 10	FOR THE EASTERN	DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10		N 2.15 01202 KING KING
11	SABRINA SMITH,	No. 2:15-cv-01293-KJM-KJN
	Plaintiff,	
13	v.	<u>ORDER</u>
14 15	H.F.D. NO. 55, INC., dba J. CREW, a California corporation; and DOES 1 to100, inclusive,	
16	Defendant.	
17		
18		
19	On September 3, 2015, the court held a hearing on defendant H.F.D. No. 55, Inc.'s	
20	motion to compel arbitration. On September 29, 2015, plaintiff gave notice a Ninth Circuit panel	
21	had issued its opinion in Sakkab v. Luxottica Retail North America, Inc., 803 F.3d 425 (9th Cir.	
22	2015). On October 20, 2015, defendant gave notice the circuit court had granted the appellant an	
23	extension of time to respond to the petition for a rehearing en banc in that case. Appellant's	
24	response was filed on January 15, 2016.	
25	Because resolution of the issue before the Sakkab court directly concerns that	
26	before this court, this case is temporarily STAYED pending the circuit court's decision whether	
27	to grant the petition for a rehearing en banc, and in the event the petition is granted, pending	
28	issuance of an en banc opinion. See Landis v. N. Am. Co., 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936) ("[T]he	
		1

1	power to stay proceedings is incidental to the power inherent in every court to control the
2	disposition of the causes on its docket with economy of time and effort for itself, for counsel, and
3	for litigants.").
4	The parties shall notify the court within seven days of any decision in Sakkab.
5	IT IS SO ORDERED.
6	DATED: February 2, 2016.
7	100 a a 1
8	1 Mule
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	2