1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 FOR THE DISTRICT OF IDAHO 9 ----00000----10 11 THE TRUSTEES OF THE EIGHTH NO. CIV. 1:12-126 WBS DISTRICT ELECTRICAL PENSION 12 AND BENEFITS FUNDS, 13 DELINQUENCY COMMITTEE OF THE MEMORANDUM AND ORDER RE: EIGHTH DISTRICT ELECTRICAL NOTICE OF BANKRUPTCY AND 14 PENSION AND BENEFIT FUNDS, and MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE IBEW LOCALS 291 and 449, AMENDED COMPLAINT 15 Plaintiffs, 16 V. 17 PORTNEUF ELECTRIC INC., an 18 Idaho Corporation, BRENT HARRIS and TERRI HARRIS, 19 Defendants. 20 21 22 ----00000----23 Plaintiffs Delinquency Committee of the Eighth District 24 Electrical Pension and Benefit Funds, IBEW Local 291, IBEW Local 25 449, and Trustees of the Eighth District Electrical Pension and 26 Benefits Funds brought suit against defendants Portneuf Electric, 27 Inc. ("Portneuf"), Brent Harris, and Terri Harris alleging 28 1

violations of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act ("ERISA") and certain collective bargaining agreements.

Plaintiffs requested leave to amend the Complaint.

(Pls.' Mot. for Leave to File Am Compl. (Docket No. 19)). The day before the hearing, defendants Brent and Terri Harris filed for bankruptcy. (Notice of Bankruptcy Filing (Docket 30).)

The notice of bankruptcy indicates that Brent and Terri Harris have "property interests" in co-defendant Portneuf Electric, (id.), though oral argument did not reveal the exact nature of those interests. Since a filing of bankruptcy requires an automatic stay of all proceedings against the debtor, 11 U.S.C. § 362(a), the court will stay all actions against Brent and Terri Harris. Furthermore, because the motion for leave to amend sought to add claims against Brent and Terri Harris, it will be denied without prejudice.

Absent special circumstances, however, "the automatic stay of § 362(a) protects only the debtor, property of the debtor or property of the estate." In re Chuqach Forest Prods., Inc., 23 F.3d 241, 246 (9th Cir. 1994); see also Ingersoll-Rand Fin.

Corp. v. Milling Mining Co., 817 F.2d 1424, 1427 (9th Cir. 1987)

("In the absence of special circumstances, stays pursuant to § 362(a) are limited to debtors and do not include non-bankrupt codefendants."). There is currently no evidence that Portneuf Electric is seeking bankruptcy, qualifies as the Harris' property, is under the administration of the bankruptcy estate, or qualifies for a stay due to special circumstances. Thus the court will decline to stay proceedings against Portneuf under § 362(a).

When there are separate proceedings against a defendant, the court has inherent authority to stay the entire action before it if a stay is "efficient for its own docket and the fairest course for the parties." Leyva v. Certified Grocers of Cal., Ltd., 593 F.2d 857, 864 (9th Cir. 1979). "A stay should not be granted unless it appears likely the other proceedings will be concluded within a reasonable time in relation to the urgency of the claims presented to the court." Id. "'[I]f there is even a fair possibility that the stay . . . will work damage to someone else,' the party seeking the stay 'must make out a clear case of hardship or inequity.'" Lockyer v. Mirant Corp., 398 F.3d 1098, 1111 (9th Cir. 2005) (quoting Landis v. N. Am. Co., 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936)).

Here, the claims against Portneuf are the primary focus of the litigation, thus it does not appear that a stay as against the Harris defendants will force the litigation to proceed on a piecemeal basis. There is no way to know how long the bankruptcy proceedings will last, plaintiffs wish to proceed against Portneuf as quickly as possible because they believe Portneuf is dissipating its assets, and their interest in the bankruptcy estate could be harmed by delaying a judgment against Portneuf. The court will therefore decline to exercise its inherent power to stay the action against Portneuf.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

(1) all proceedings in this action as against Brent and Terri Harris only shall be, and the same hereby are, STAYED pursuant to the provisions of 11 U.S.C. § 362(a) pending resolution of their bankruptcy proceeding; and

(2) plaintiffs' motion for leave to file an Amended Complaint be, and the same hereby is, DENIED.

This action shall proceed as against Portneuf, but the court may reconsider whether to stay the action its entirety should evidence indicate that such a stay is appropriate under either § 362(a) or the court's inherent authority.

DATED: October 22, 2012

Milliam

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE