



1 *Valley* and *Saticoy Bay* offer starkly conflicting views on the central question in the instant case,  
2 the constitutionality of potentially thousands of Nevada’s non-judicial foreclosure sales may  
3 ultimately be decided by the United States Supreme Court.<sup>5</sup>

4 Nationstar Mortgage now moves to lift the stay in this case.<sup>6</sup> Defendant Saticoy Bay  
5 opposes the request and asks me to keep the stay in place until the petitions for certiorari are  
6 resolved.<sup>7</sup> To save the parties from the need or inclination to invest resources briefing the effect  
7 of the *Bourne Valley* and *Saticoy Bay* opinions before the United States Supreme Court has ruled  
8 on the petitions for certiorari review in these cases, I deny the motion to lift the stay.

9 **Discussion**

10 A district court has the inherent power to stay cases to control its docket and promote the  
11 efficient use of judicial resources.<sup>8</sup> When determining whether a stay is appropriate pending the  
12 resolution of another case—often called a “*Landis* stay”—the district court must weigh: (1) the  
13 possible damage that may result from a stay, (2) any “hardship or inequity” that a party may  
14 suffer if required to go forward, (3) “and the orderly course of justice measured in terms of the  
15 simplifying or complicating of issues, proof, and questions of law” that a stay will engender.<sup>9</sup>  
16 After weighing these considerations, I find that a *Landis* stay remains appropriate here. I address  
17 these considerations in reverse order.

18  
19  
20 \_\_\_\_\_  
21 The United States Supreme Court has extended the deadline for the *Bourne Valley* cert petition to  
22 April 3, 2017. Case No. 16A753 (Feb 24, 2017).

23 <sup>5</sup> See S.C.R. 10(a) (suggesting that a conflict between a circuit court and “a state court of last  
24 resort” on “an important federal question” can be a basis for granting review on a writ of  
25 certiorari).

26 <sup>6</sup> ECF No. 47. I find this motion suitable for disposition without oral argument. Nev. L.R. 78-1.

27 <sup>7</sup> ECF No. 48.

28 <sup>8</sup> *Landis v. North American Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 254–55 (1936); *Dependable Highway Exp., Inc.*  
*v. Navigators Ins. Co.*, 498 F.3d 1059, 1066 (9th Cir. 2007).

<sup>9</sup> *Lockyer v. Mirant Corp.*, 398 F.3d 1098, 1110 (9th Cir. 2005).

1 **A. A stay will promote the orderly course of justice.**

2 At the center of this case is an HOA-foreclosure sale under NRS Chapter 116 and the  
3 competing arguments that the foreclosure sale either extinguished the bank’s security interest or  
4 had no legal effect because the statutory scheme violates due process. The United States  
5 Supreme Court’s consideration of petitions for certiorari in *Bourne Valley* and *Saticoy Bay* have  
6 the potential to be dispositive of this case or at least of discrete issues that it presents. As the  
7 jurisprudence in this area of unique Nevada law continues to evolve, the parties in the scores of  
8 foreclosure-challenge actions pending in this courthouse file new motions or move to supplement  
9 the ones that they already have pending, often resulting in docket-clogging entries and an  
10 impossible-to-follow chain of briefs in which arguments are abandoned and replaced. Staying  
11 this case pending the Supreme Court’s disposition of the petitions for certiorari in *Bourne Valley*  
12 and *Saticoy Bay* will permit the parties to evaluate—and me to consider—the viability of the  
13 claims under the most complete precedent. This will simplify and streamline the proceedings  
14 and promote the efficient use of the parties’ and the court’s resources.

15 **B. Hardship and inequity**

16 Both parties face the prospect of hardship if I resolve the claims or issues in this case  
17 before the petitions for certiorari have been decided. Denying this motion to lift stay at this time  
18 and effectively extending this stay will prevent unnecessary briefing and the expenditures of  
19 time, attorney’s fees, and resources that could be wasted—or at least prematurely spent—should  
20 the Supreme Court take up these cases.

21 **C. Damage from a stay**

22 The only potential damage that may result from a stay is that the parties will have to wait  
23 longer for resolution of this case and any motions that they have filed or intend to file in the  
24 future. But a delay would also result from any rebriefing or supplemental briefing that may be  
25 necessitated if the Supreme Court grants certiorari and resolves this circuit-state split. So it is not  
26 clear to me that a stay pending the Supreme Court’s disposition of the petitions for certiorari will  
27 ultimately lengthen the life of this case. I thus find that any possible damage that the extension  
28 of this stay may cause the parties is minimal.


1 **D. The length of the stay is reasonable.**

2 Finally, I note that the stay extension in this case pending the disposition of the petitions  
3 for certiorari in *Bourne Valley* and *Saticoy Bay* is expected to be reasonably short. The petition  
4 in *Bourne Valley* is due April 3, 2017, and the petition in *Saticoy Bay* is due April 25, 2017.  
5 Because the length of this stay extension is directly tied to the petition proceedings in those  
6 cases, it is reasonably brief, and it is not indefinite.

7 **Conclusion**

8 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that **the motion to lift stay [ECF No. 47] is denied**  
9 **without prejudice to the filing of a new motion after the Supreme Court rules on the**  
10 ***Bourne Valley* and *Saticoy Bay* petitions for certiorari review.**

11 DATED: February 27, 2017

12   
13 \_\_\_\_\_  
14 Jennifer A. Dorsey  
15 United States District Judge  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28