

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

JAVAN DEVORE, et al.,

Case No. 13-cv-01841 RS

Plaintiffs,

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO  
STAY AND CONTINUING CASE  
MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE**

v.

PROSPECT MORTGAGE, LLC,

Defendant.

Defendant’s motion to stay this action pending a decision by the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation as to whether it will be transferred to a coordinated proceeding is suitable for disposition without oral argument, pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-1(b). The hearing set for October 7, 2013 is therefore vacated.

A court is not deprived of its jurisdiction or otherwise limited in its ability to proceed with a case merely because a party has filed a motion for consolidation with the MDL panel. *In re Air Crash Disaster at Paris, France, on March 3, 1974*, 376 F. Supp. 887, 888 (J.P.M.L. 1974). Nevertheless, courts have the inherent authority to stay proceedings as a way “to control [their] docket and promote efficient use of judicial resources.” *Dependable Highway Exp., Inc. v. Navigators Ins. Co.*, 498 F.3d 1059, 1066 (9th Cir. 2007). District courts considering virtually identical stay motions in other actions like this growing out of the *Sliger* de-certification

1 stipulation have reached inconsistent results. Given that the decision to grant such stays is entirely  
2 discretionary, this is unsurprising.

3 Although the question is close, in light of plaintiffs' representations that there will be no  
4 motion practice herein, the stay will be denied. Because all plaintiffs in the post-*Sliger* actions are  
5 represented by the same counsel, and because individualized discovery will be required regardless  
6 of the forum, the risk of duplicative or ultimately wasteful discovery is minimal. The parties also  
7 have already engaged in their Rule 26(f) conference and the initial disclosure process. While a  
8 scheduling order has not been entered, and will not be entered, delaying plaintiffs' initial discovery  
9 efforts would not be warranted. The initial Case Management Conference, however, will be  
10 continued to January 9, 2014, at 10:00 a.m., with the expectation that a decision by the MDL panel  
11 will issue prior to that date.

12  
13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14  
15 Dated: 10/3/13



16 RICHARD SEEBORG  
17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28