

1 ARIEL E. STERN, ESQ.
 Nevada Bar No. 8276
 2 THERA A. COOPER, ESQ.
 Nevada Bar No. 13468
 3 **AKERMAN LLP**
 1160 Town Center Drive, Suite 330
 4 Las Vegas, NV 89144
 Telephone: (702) 634-5000
 5 Facsimile: (702) 380-8572
 Email: ariel.stern@akerman.com
 6 Email: thera.cooper@akerman.com

7 Attorneys for Bank of America, N.A. as
 successor by merger to BAC Home Loans
 8 Servicing, LP f/k/a Countrywide Home Loans
 Servicing LP and Federal National Mortgage
 9 Association

10 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 11 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

AKERMAN LLP
 1160 TOWN CENTER DRIVE, SUITE 330
 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89144
 TEL.: (702) 634-5000 – FAX: (702) 380-8572

13 FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE
 ASSOCIATION; BANK OF AMERICA, N.A.
 14 AS SUCCESSOR BY MERGER TO BAC
 HOME LOANS SERVICING, LP FKA
 15 COUNTRYWIDE HOME LOANS SERVICING
 LP,

16 Plaintiffs,

17 vs.

18 COPPER CREEK HOMEOWNER'S
 ASSOCIATION; HAMPTON & HAMPTON
 19 P.C.,

20 Defendants.

Case No.: 2:16-cv-02934-RFB-PAL

**STIPULATION AND ORDER TO
 STAY LITIGATION PENDING FINAL
 RESOLUTION OF PETITION(S) FOR
 WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO UNITED
 STATES SUPREME COURT**

22 Plaintiffs Bank of America, N.A. as successor by merger to BAC Home Loans Servicing, LP
 23 f/k/a Countrywide Home Loans Servicing LP (**BANA**) and Federal National Mortgage Association
 24 (**Fannie Mae**), and Defendants Copper Creek Homeowners' Association (**Copper Creek**) and
 25 Hampton & Hampton, P.C. (**Hampton**), through their counsel of record, stipulate as follows:

26 1. This lawsuit involves the parties seeking quiet title/declaratory relief and other claims
 27 related to a non-judicial homeowner's association foreclosure sale conducted on a Property pursuant to
 28 NRS 116.

1 2. On August 12, 2016, the Ninth Circuit issued its decision on appeal in Bourne Valley
2 Court Tr. v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., 832 F.3d 1154, 1159-60 (9th Cir. 2016) holding that NRS 116 is
3 facially unconstitutional. The Court of Appeals issued its mandate in the appeal on December 14,
4 2016, vacating and remanding the judgment to the United States District Court, District of Nevada.

5 3. On January 26, 2017, the Nevada Supreme Court issued its decision in Saticoy Bay
6 LLC Series 350 Durango 104 v. Wells Fargo Home Mortgage, a Div. of Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., 133
7 Nev. Adv. Op. 5, ___ P.3d ___, 2017 WL 398426 (Nev. Jan. 26, 2017), holding, in direct contrast to
8 Bourne Valley, that no state action supported a challenge under the Due Process Clause of the United
9 States Constitution.

10 4. The parties in Bourne Valley and Saticoy Bay are seeking review of both decisions in
11 the United States Supreme Court. Bourne Valley's deadline to file its petition for writ of certiorari of
12 the Ninth Circuit's Bourne Valley decision is April 3, 2017. See Bourne Valley Court Trust v. Wells
13 Fargo Bank, NA., United States Supreme Court Case No. 16A753. Wells Fargo's deadline to file its
14 petition for writ of certiorari of the Nevada Supreme Court's Saticoy Bay decision is April 25, 2017.
15 Thus, the parties believe that the stay requested herein is appropriate.

16 5. On February 8, 2017, the Nevada Supreme Court stayed the issuance of the remittitur in
17 Saticoy Bay pending the filing of a petition for a writ of certiorari with the United States Supreme
18 Court, and if a petition is filed, the stay of the remittitur will remain in effect until final disposition of
19 the certiorari proceedings before the United States Supreme Court.

20 6. Since then, several judges in this district have stayed similar cases pending the
21 exhaustion of all appeals before the United States Supreme Court. E.g., Nationstar Mtg. LLC v. Green
22 Valley S. Owners Assoc., No. 2:16-cv-00883-GMN-GWF; Bank of America, N.A. v. Canyon Willow
23 Trop Owners' Assoc., No. 2:16-cv-01327-GMN-VCF (D. Nev. Oct. 26, 2016); Deutsche Bank Nat'l
24 Trust Co. v. Copper Sands HOA, No. 2:16-cv-00763-JAD-CWH (D. Nev. Feb. 28, 2017).

25 7. To determine if a continued stay is appropriate, the Court considers (1) damage from
26 the stay; (2) hardship or inequity that befalls one party more than the other; and (3) the orderly course
27 of justice. See Dependable Highway Exp., Inc. v. Navigators Ins. Co., 498 F.3d 1059, 1066 (9th Cir.
28 2007) (setting forth factors). Here, the factors support a stay of litigation.

1 a. Damage from Stay: Any damage from a temporary stay in this case will be minimal if
2 balanced against the potential fees, costs, and time which would surely ensue in this matter if litigation
3 were allowed to continue that could be mooted by a decision in Bourne Valley certiorari proceedings.
4 Indeed, the parties will be able to avoid the cost and expense of continued legal proceedings in light
5 of what is unsettled law to say the least. Moreover, the Court will be relieved of expending further
6 time and effort until the conflict between the circuit and Nevada Supreme Court is resolved. Thus, a
7 stay will benefit all parties involved herein.

8 b. Hardship or Inequity: There will be no significant hardship or inequity that befalls one
9 party more than the other. This relatively equal balance of equities results from the need for all parties
10 to have finality, given the split in the state and federal court decisions. The parties agree that any
11 hardship or inequity falling on any of them is outweighed by the benefits of a stay.

12 c. Orderly Course of Justice: At the center of this case is a homeowners' association's
13 foreclosure sale under NRS 116. The outcome of the petitions for writ in Bourne Valley and/or
14 Saticoy Bay have the potential to affirm or overturn either case. Without a stay, the parties will
15 expend resources that will be unnecessary if either or both petitions are granted. A stay would also
16 avoid a likely appeal from any subsequent judgment in this case. A temporary stay would
17 substantially promote the orderly course of justice in this case. A stay will avoid the moving forward
18 without final resolution of the federal issues and the state court/federal court conflict.

19 8. The parties agree that all proceedings in the instant case, including motion and other
20 litigation deadlines, are stayed pending final resolution of the Bourne Valley and/or Saticoy Bay
21 certiorari proceedings before the United States Supreme Court.

22 9. Defendant Copper Creek shall be required to keep current on all property taxes and
23 assessments, HOA dues, maintain the property, and maintain insurance on the property at issue.

24 10. Defendant Copper Creek shall be prohibited from selling or encumbering the property
25 unless otherwise ordered by the Court.

26 11. Plaintiff BANA is prohibited from conducting foreclosure proceedings on the property
27 unless otherwise ordered by the Court.

28 ///

1 12. Any party may file a written motion to lift stay at any time for either party determines it
2 appropriate.

3 Dated this 15th day of March, 2017.

Dated this 15th day of March, 2017.

4 **AKERMAN LLP**

HAMPTON & HAMPTON, P.C.

5
6 /s/ Thera A. Cooper
7 ARIEL E. STERN, ESQ.
8 Nevada Bar No. 8276
9 THERA A. COOPER, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 13468
1160 Town Center Drive, Suite 330
Las Vegas, Nevada 89144

/s/ Jay Hampton
MILES HAMPTON, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 5350
JAY HAMPTON, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 9050
8965 S. Pecos Road
Henderson, NV 89074

10 Attorneys for Bank of America, N.A. as successor by
11 merger to BAC Home Loans Servicing, LP f/k/a
12 Countrywide Home Loans Servicing LP and Federal
National Mortgage Association

Attorneys for Hampton & Hampton P.C.

13 Dated this 15th day of March, 2017.

14 **LIPSON, NEILSON, COLE, SELTZER & GARIN, P.C.**

15 /s/ Amber m. Williams
16 KALEB D. ANDERSON, ESQ.
17 Nevada Bar No. 7582
18 AMBER M. WILLIAMS, ESQ.
19 Nevada Bar No. 12301
9900 Covington Cross Dr.
Suite 120
Las Vegas, NV 89144

20 Attorneys for Copper Creek Homeowners' Association

21
22 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

23
24 
25 RICHARD F. BOULWARE, II
26 United States District Judge

27 DATED: March 22, 2017.