

1 decision . . . of a United States court of appeals”). I therefore *sua sponte* stay this case pending a
2 decision on the petitions for certiorari in *Bourne Valley* and *Saticoy Bay*.

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

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

25 Resolving the claims or issues in this case before the Supreme Court decides whether to
26 grant or deny the petitions could impose a hardship on both parties. A stay will prevent
27
28

1 unnecessary or premature briefing on *Bourne Valley* and *Saticoy Bay*'s impact on this case. Thus,
2 I will deny the pending motion to dismiss without prejudice to it being renewed later.

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

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

14 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that defendant Saticoy Bay LLC Series 7320 Camrose
15 Ridge's motion to dismiss (ECF No. 14) is **DENIED without prejudice**.

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

20 DATED this 11th day of April, 2017.

21 

22 _____
23 ANDREW P. GORDON
24 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

25
26 _____
27 ¹ 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).