1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	00000	
11		
12	DRUM LODGE, LLC,	No. 2:24-cv-00219 WBS JDP
13	Plaintiff,	
14	v.	ORDER RE: MOTION FOR AWARD OF
15	MARTEL CONSTRUCTION, INC.,	ATTORNEYS' FEES
16	Defendant.	
17		
18	00000	
19	On April 4, 2024, the court dismissed with prejudice	
20	plaintiff Drum Lodge, LLC's petition to vacate an arbitration	
21	award in defendant Martel Construction, Inc.'s favor. (Order	
22	(Docket No. 20).) This closed the case. Drum Lodge then filed	
23	notice of appeal, which appeal is currently pending. (Docket	
24	Nos. 23, 24.) Now, Martel moves for its attorneys' fees	
25	incurred to successfully defend against Drum Lodge's failed	
2	netition to wacate (Mot (Docke	+ No 27-1)

Courts have discretion to defer ruling on a motion for attorney's fees or to deny the motion without prejudice while an

appeal is pending. Fed R. Civ. P. 54(d) (2) advisory committee's note to 1993 amendment ("If an appeal on the merits of the case is taken, the court may rule on the claim for fees, may defer its ruling on the motion, or may deny the motion without prejudice, directing under subdivision (d) (2) (B) a new period for filing after the appeal has been resolved."); see also People for Ethical Treatment of Animals, Inc. v. Los Angeles Cnty. Metro.

Transit Auth., No. 221CV07662SSSMAAX, 2023 WL 6369702, at *2 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 17, 2023); Planet Aid, Inc. v. Reveal, Ctr. for Investigative Reporting, No. 17-CV-03695-MMC, 2021 WL 4051420, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 27, 2021); Stillwater Ltd. v. Basilotta, No. 2:16-CV-1895-SK, 2021 WL 7285989, at *1 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 12, 2021); Freeman Inv. Mgmt. Co., LLC v. Frank Russell Co., No. 13-CV-2856 JLS (RBB), 2017 WL 11420268, at *1 (S.D. Cal. Feb. 9, 2017).

"[I]f the claim for fees involves substantial issues or is likely to be affected by the appellate decision, the district court may prefer to defer consideration of the claim for fees until after the appeal is resolved." Fed. R. Civ. P. 58 advisory committee's note to 1993 amendment; see also G.P.P., Inc. v. Guardian Prot. Prod., Inc., No. 1:15-CV-00321 SKO, 2018 WL 932087 (E.D. Cal. Feb. 16, 2018) (citing same re: exercise of such discretion).

Such is the case here: Drum Lodge's pending appeal is centrally related to the propriety of awarding attorneys' fees in relation to Drum Lodge's petition to vacate the arbitration award. The order from which the pending appeal has been taken granted Martel's motion to dismiss Drum Lodge's petition, thereby

deeming Martel the prevailing party. (See generally Order.) The court also reviewed and subsequently left undisturbed the arbitration panel's award of attorneys' fees to Martel under the "manifest disregard for the law" standard. (Id.) Both determinations are central to Martel's instant motion for fees, such that if either determination were to be reversed on appeal, Martel's current motion would likely be rendered moot. In addition, regardless of whichever party prevails on appeal, additional fee motions are likely to follow.

Accordingly, in the interest of judicial efficiency and pursuant to its discretion to do so, the court concludes that any motion for attorneys' fees is best adjudicated on the merits following a final resolution of Drum Lodge's appeal.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Martel's motion for award of attorneys' fees (Docket No. 27) be, and the same hereby is, DENIED without prejudice to renewal upon the final resolution of

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

¹⁸

See, e.g., Dufour v. Allen, No. 2:14-cv-5616 CAS (SSx), 2015 WL 12819170, at *2 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 26, 2015) (finding, after "distributing a lengthy tentative order" and hearing oral argument, that "the best course of action is to defer ruling on the [motions for attorney's fees] until the resolution of [the plaintiff's] appeal"); Harrell v. George, No. 2:11-cv-00253-MCE DAD PS, 2012 WL 5906659, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 26, 2012) (deferring attorney's fees motion by defendant who prevailed on successful motion to strike pending appeal before the Ninth Circuit); Sovereign Gen. Ins. Servs., Inc. v. Scottsdale Ins. Co., No. 2:05-cv-00389 MCE DAD, 2008 WL 5381813, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Dec. 23, 2008) (denying motion for attorney's fees without prejudice to renewal following disposition of the matter on appeal); Flores v. Emerich & Fike, No. 1:05-CV-0291 OWW DLB, 2007 WL 963282, at *7 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 29, 2007) (same); Lasic v. Moreno, No. 2:05-cv-0161 MCE DAD, 2007 WL 4180655, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 21, 2007) (same re: bill of costs).

-	
1	Drum Lodge's currently pending appeal (Docket Nos. 23, 24).
2	line of a second
3	Milliam & Shubt WILLIAM B. SHUBB
4	Dated: June 4, 2024 WILLIAM B. SHUBB UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	