

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

\* \* \*

CARRINGTON MORTGAGE  
SERVICES, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

SATICOY BAY, LLC, *et al.*

Defendants.

Case No. 2:15-cv-01852-APG-PAL

**ORDER (1) DENYING MOTION TO  
LIFT STAY AND (2) DEEMING  
ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE  
SATISFIED**

(ECF No. 114)

10 This is one of many disputes over the effect of a nonjudicial foreclosure sale conducted by  
11 a homeowners association (“HOA”) after the prior owner failed to pay HOA assessments. On  
12 August 12, 2016, a divided Ninth Circuit panel in *Bourne Valley Court Trust v. Wells Fargo Bank*  
13 held that Nevada Revised Statutes Chapter 116’s HOA nonjudicial foreclosure scheme, as it  
14 existed before the statutory scheme was amended in 2015, “facially violated mortgage lenders’  
15 constitutional due process rights.” 832 F.3d 1154, 1155 (9th Cir. 2016); *but see id.* at \*6-11  
16 (Wallace, J., dissenting). I previously stayed this case pending issuance of the mandate in *Bourne*  
17 *Valley* because counsel for the purchaser in that case had indicated that he would be filing a  
18 motion for panel rehearing and rehearing en banc. ECF No. 109. Those motions were denied and  
19 the mandate issued on December 14, 2016. *Bourne Valley Court Tr. v. Wells Fargo Bank*, 9th Cir.  
20 Dkt. No. 15-15233, ECF Nos. 75, 76.

21 Plaintiff Carrington Mortgage Services, LLC moves to lift the stay because the mandate in  
22 *Bourne Valley* has issued. However, the Supreme Court of Nevada recently decided *Saticoy Bay*  
23 *LLC Series 350 Durango 104 v. Wells Fargo Home Mortgage*, holding that “the Due Process  
24 Clauses of the United States and Nevada Constitutions are not implicated in an HOA’s nonjudicial  
25 foreclosure of a superpriority lien.” 388 P.3d 970, 975 (Nev. 2017). The losing parties in both  
26 *Bourne Valley* and *Saticoy Bay* have indicated they intend to file petitions for certiorari in the  
27 United States Supreme Court. Because *Bourne Valley* and *Saticoy Bay* reached opposite  
28

1 conclusions, the constitutionality of Nevada’s HOA nonjudicial foreclosure scheme may be  
2 decided by the United States Supreme Court. *See* Sup. Ct. R. 10(b) (identifying as a compelling  
3 reason for granting certiorari that “a state court of last resort has decided an important federal  
4 question in a way that conflicts with the decision . . . of a United States court of appeals”). I  
5 therefore *sua sponte* continue the stay in this case pending a decision on the petitions for  
6 certiorari in *Bourne Valley* and *Saticoy Bay*.

7 A district court has the inherent power to stay cases to control its docket and promote the  
8 efficient use of judicial resources. *Landis v. N. Am. Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 254-55 (1936);  
9 *Dependable Highway Exp., Inc. v. Navigators Ins. Co.*, 498 F.3d 1059, 1066 (9th Cir. 2007).  
10 When determining whether to stay a case pending the resolution of another case, I must consider  
11 (1) the possible damage that may result from a stay, (2) any “hardship or inequity” that a party  
12 may suffer if required to go forward, (3) “and the orderly course of justice measured in terms of  
13 the simplifying or complicating of issues, proof, and questions of law” that a stay will engender.  
14 *Lockyer v. Mirant Corp.*, 398 F.3d 1098, 1110 (9th Cir. 2005). I find that a *Landis* stay is  
15 appropriate here.

16 The crux of the parties’ dispute is whether the HOA foreclosure sale extinguished the  
17 deed of trust. If the HOA sale was void because Chapter 116 is facially unconstitutional, then the  
18 parties’ dispute is, in large part, resolved or at least simplified. The Supreme Court’s  
19 consideration of the petitions in *Bourne Valley* and *Saticoy Bay* thus could be dispositive of this  
20 case, or at least of significant issues in the case. As the jurisprudence and the parties’ arguments  
21 in this area evolve, the parties file new motions or move to supplement the pending briefs,  
22 burdening our already-busy docket. *Bourne Valley* and *Saticoy Bay* no doubt will inspire more  
23 motions and supplements. Staying this case pending the Supreme Court’s disposition of the  
24 petitions in *Bourne Valley* and *Saticoy Bay* will permit the parties to present arguments and  
25 evidence in the context of complete and resolved precedent, and it will allow me to evaluate the  
26 claims in light of this legal authority. Consequently, a stay pending the disposition of the  
27  
28

1 certiorari proceedings will simplify the proceedings and promote the efficient use of the parties'  
2 and the court's resources.

3 Resolving the claims or issues in this case before the Supreme Court decides whether to  
4 grant or deny the petitions could impose a hardship on both parties. A stay will prevent  
5 unnecessary or premature briefing on *Bourne Valley* and *Saticoy Bay*'s impact on this case.

6 The potential damage that may result from a stay is that the parties will have to wait  
7 longer for resolution of this case and any motions that they intend to file in the future. But a  
8 delay would also result from new briefing that may be necessitated if the Supreme Court grants  
9 certiorari. So a stay pending the Supreme Court's decision will not necessarily lengthen the life  
10 of this case. Any possible damage that a stay may cause is minimal.

11 Finally, I expect the stay pending the Supreme Court's disposition of the petitions for  
12 certiorari to be reasonably short. The petition in *Bourne Valley* was filed on April 3, 2017. The  
13 petition in *Saticoy Bay* is due April 25, 2017. The length of this stay is tied to the Supreme  
14 Court's decision on the petitions for certiorari, so the stay will be reasonably brief and is not  
15 indefinite.<sup>1</sup> The stay will remain in place until the proceedings in the Supreme Court have  
16 concluded.

17 I deem the order to show cause (ECF No. 109) satisfied. Although defendant Hampton &  
18 Hampton Collections, LLC argues that Carrington is a California citizen because it is  
19 headquartered there, the membership of a limited liability company is determined by the  
20 citizenship of its members, not by its principal place of business. *See Johnson v. Columbia*  
21 *Properties Anchorage, LP*, 437 F.3d 894, 899 (9th Cir. 2006) (stating that "an LLC is a citizen of  
22 every state of which its owners/members are citizens"). It appears diversity jurisdiction exists in  
23 this case and I therefore will not dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

24 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that plaintiff Carrington Mortgage Services, LLC's  
25 motion to lift stay (ECF No. 114) is **DENIED without prejudice**.

26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 <sup>1</sup> The Supreme Court of Nevada stayed the issuance of the remittitur in *Saticoy Bay* pending the  
28 Supreme Court's disposition of the certiorari proceedings. No. 68630, Dkt. No. 17-04543 (Nev. Feb. 8, 2017).

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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this case is administratively **STAYED**. Once the proceedings in the United States Supreme Court in *Bourne Valley Court Trust v. Wells Fargo Bank* and *Saticoy Bay LLC Series 350 Durango 104 v. Wells Fargo Home Mortgage* have concluded, any party may move to lift the stay.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the order to show cause (ECF No. 109) is deemed satisfied.

DATED this 11th day of April, 2017.



---

ANDREW P. GORDON  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE