| 1 | WRIGHT, FINLAY & ZAK, LLP Edgar C. Smith, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 5506 esmith@wrightlegal.net Aaron D. Lancaster, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 10115 alancaster@wrightlegal.net 7785 W. Sahara Ave., Suite 200 Las Vegas, NV, 89117 (702) 475-7967; Fax: (702) 946-1345 | |
|-----|--|---|
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | Attorneys for Plaintiff, Bank of America, N.A. | |
| 8 9 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA | |
| 10 | BANK OF AMERICA, N.A., | Case No.: 2:16-cv-01692-APG-GWF |
| 11 | Plaintiff, | |
| 12 | VS. | STIPULATION AND ORDER FOR LIMITED STAY AS TO CLAIMS |
| 13 | | ASSERTED AGAINST INDIGO |
| 14 | OPERTURE INC., a corporation; BRIDGER INVESTMENT LLC, a Nevada limited liability | HOMEOWNERS' ASSOCITION |
| 15 | company; GEORGE PETER LEE; ALESSI & KOENIG, LLC, a Nevada limited liability | |
| 16 | company; INDIGO HOMEOWNERS' | |
| 17 | ASSOCIATION, a Nevada non-profit corporation; and DOES I through X, and ROE | |
| 18 | CORPORATIONS I through X, inclusive, | |
| 19 | Defendants. | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | Plaintiff, Bank of America, N.A. ("BANA"), and Defendant, Indigo Homeowners | |
| 22 | Association ("HOA"), by and through their respective counsels of record, hereby stipulates a | |
| 23 | follows in accordance with LR6-1 and LR 26-4. | |
| 24 | "[T]he power to stay proceedings is incidental to the power inherent in every court t | |
| 25 | control the disposition of the causes of action on its docket with economy of time and effort fo itself, for counsel, and for litigants." <i>Landis v. N. Am. Co.</i> , 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936). "A tria | |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | | |
| 28 | court may, with propriety, find it is efficient fo | r its own docket and the fairest course for the |
| | | |

parties to enter a stay of an action before it, pending resolution of independent proceedings which bear upon the case." *Leyva v. Certified Grocers of Cal., Ltd.*, 593 F.2d 857, 863 (9th Cir. 1979). In deciding whether to grant a stay, a court may weigh the following: (1) the possible damage which may result from the granting of a stay; (2) the hardship or inequity which a party may suffer in being required to go forward; (3) the orderly course of justice measured in terms of the simplifying or complicating of issues, proof, and questions of law which could be expected to result from a stay. *CMAX, Inc. v. Hall*, 300 F.2d 265, 268 (9th Cir. 1962).

WHEREAS the above-captioned matter concerns claims regarding real property located at 9268 Lapeer St., Las Vegas, NV 89178-6295, APN 176-20-213-022 (the "Property").

WHEREAS, the Court entered an Order Granting Motion for Default Judgment [ECF No. 45] on February 7, 2018, against Defendants George Peter Lee and Bridger Investment LLC. After the entry of the Order Granting Motion for Default Judgment counsel made an appearance for the Defendant George Peter Lee [ECF No. 46].

WHEREAS, BANA and HOA agree that if the Order Granting Motion for Default Judgment is not set aside, overruled or modified the claims asserted by BANA against the HOA will be substantial affect or even moot. The parties further agree that a temporary stay regarding the claims asserted by BANA against the HOA in this case until the time period to set aside, appeal or amend the Order Granting Motion for Default Judgment has expired will preserve their own and judicial resources.

WHEREAS, this stipulation tolls any statute of limitations, the doctrine of laches or any other defense based on lapse of time; and this stipulation may be modified, amended, or supplemented only by an order from this Court.

NOW WHEREFORE, based on the foregoing,

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED that staying this case regarding the