1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STAT	ES DISTRICT COURT
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WHEAT	CIV. NO. 2:17-2401 WBS EFB
12	GROWERS; NATIONAL CORN GROWERS ASSOCIATION; UNITED	ORDER RE: MOTION TO STAY
13	STATES DURUM GROWERS ASSOCIATION; WESTERN PLANT	
14	HEALTH ASSOCIATION; IOWA SOYBEAN ASSOCIATION; SOUTH	
15	DAKOTA AGRI-BUSINESS ASSOCIATION; NORTH DAKOTA	
16	GRAIN GROWERS ASSOCIATION; MISSOURI CHAMBER OF COMMERCE	
17	AND INDUSTRY; MONSANTO COMPANY; ASSOCIATED	
18	INDUSTRIES OF MISSOURI; AGRIBUSINESS ASSOCIATION OF	
19	IOWA; CROPLIFE AMERICA; AND AGRICULTURAL RETAILERS	
20	ASSOCIATION,	
21	Plaintiffs,	
22	V.	
23	LAUREN ZEISE, IN HER OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS DIRECTOR OF THE	
24	OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT; and	
25	XAVIER BECERRA, in his official capacity as Attorney	
26	General of the State of California,	
27		
28	Defendants.	

Before the court is defendant Xavier Becerra's Motion

1

2

3

4

5

7

9

8

10

12

1314

15

16

17

1819

20

2.1

22

24

23

2526

27

28

to Stay Proceedings. (Docket No. 104.) The court held a hearing on the motion on September 4, 2018.

The power to stay proceedings "is incidental to the

power inherent in every court to control the disposition of the cases on its docket with economy of time and effort for itself, for counsel, and for litigants." Landis v. N. Am. Co., 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936). Here, the court, in granting a preliminary injunction, relied on the Ninth Circuit's interpretation of Zauderer v. Office of Disciplinary Counsel of Supreme Court of Ohio, 471 U.S. 626, 651 (1985), in determining that the required warning label for glyphosate would not be "purely factual and uncontroversial." The primary case the court relied on, CTIA-The Wireless Association v. City of Berkeley, 854 F.3d 1105 (9th Cir. 2017), has since been vacated by the Supreme Court for further proceedings in light of National Institute of Family & Life Advocates v. Becerra, 138 S. Ct. 2361 (2018). Moreover, a more recent decision also interpreting Zauderer's "purely factual and uncontroversial" requirement, American Beverage Association v. City and County of San Francisco, 871 F.3d 884 (9th Cir. 2017), was called en banc and is scheduled for oral argument later this month.

Because <u>CTIA</u> and <u>American Beverage</u> concern the interpretation and application of <u>Zauderer's</u> "purely factual and uncontroversial" requirement, new decisions in those cases would assist the court in deciding any motion for summary judgment filed by the parties in this case. Further, the court has

already granted a preliminary injunction blocking enforcement of the warning requirement as to glyphosate in this case. Plaintiffs identify no prejudice from a stay other than uncertainty to their members due to further delay. This uncertainty is insufficient to outweigh the savings of time and effort for the court and the parties that may be gained from staying this case pending further guidance from the Ninth Circuit in CTIA or American Beverage.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that all proceedings in this case are hereby STAYED pending issuance of opinions by the Ninth Circuit in American Beverage Association v. City and County of San Francisco, No. 16-16072, and CTIA-The Wireless Association v. City of Berkeley, No. 16-15141. When the Ninth Circuit has issued opinions in both those cases, counsel shall take the necessary steps to have this matter placed back on the calendar for further status conference. The briefing schedule and hearing date of January 22, 2019 on the cross-motions for summary judgment are vacated.

- No Shet

Dated: September 5, 2018

2.1

2.7

WILLIAM B. SHUBB

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Notably, counsel for plaintiff explained multiple times at oral argument that he was not claiming "the sky would fall" if a stay was granted.