



1 proceedings. Respondents do not oppose the request. ECF No. 42. I find that good cause exists  
2 to stay the action. *See Pace v. DiGuglielmo*, 544 U.S. 408, 416 (2005) (citing *Rhines v. Weber*,  
3 544 U.S. 269, 278 (2005)).

4 IT THEREFORE IS ORDERED that petitioner's motion to stay (ECF No. 41) is  
5 **GRANTED**.

6 IT FURTHER IS ORDERED that this action is **STAYED** pending exhaustion of the  
7 unexhausted claims. Petitioner must return to this court with a motion to reopen within forty-  
8 five (45) days of issuance of the remittitur by the Nevada Supreme Court at the conclusion of the  
9 state court proceedings. Further, petitioner or respondents otherwise may move to reopen the  
10 action and seek any relief appropriate under the circumstances.

11 IT FURTHER IS ORDERED that the clerk of court administratively close this action  
12 until such time as the court grants a motion to reopen the action.

13 Dated: July 28, 2020.

14  
15   
16 \_\_\_\_\_  
ANDREW P. GORDON  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE