IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

RYAN MCFADYEN, et al.,)
Plaintiffs,)
V.)
DUIZE UNIVEDOTV at al)
DUKE UNIVERSITY, et al.,)
Defendants.)

1:07-CV-953

PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO STAY PROCEEDINGS ON DEFENDANTS TARA LEVICY, GARY SMITH, DUKE UNIVERSITY, AND DUKE UNIVERSITY HEALTH SYSTEM'S JOINT MOTION FOR JUDGMENT ON THE PLEADINGS

Plaintiffs Ryan McFadyen, Matthew Wilson, and, Breck Archer, by undersigned counsel, hereby move to stay proceedings on the Joint Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings ("Joint Motion") (ECF 335) filed by Tara Levicy ("Levicy"), Gary Smith ("Smith"), Duke University ("Duke"), and Duke University Health System, Inc. ("DUHS") (hereinafter referred to collectively as the "Duke Defendants").

This Court previously denied the Duke Defendants' motions to dismiss as to Counts 1, 2, and 18 against Levicy, Count 2 for Smith, and Count 32 against Duke and DUHS in its consolidated ruling on all of the Defendants' motions to dismiss. *See* Order (ECF 186) at 45-71, 143-150, and 195-198. The Duke Defendants have filed yet another Rule 12 motion in this case, originally filed December 18, 2007, seeking dismissal of certain claims solely based on the decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit on the City Defendants' interlocutory appeal of this Court's rulings on their immunity defenses (ECF 322).

Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court stay the proceedings on the Joint Motion, including the time for Plaintiffs to file a response in opposition, until the appellate proceedings upon which the Duke Defendants rely in the Joint Motion are concluded. "This Court

possesses the authority to hold a motion in abeyance if resolution of a pending matter will help clarify the current issues or make currently disputed issues moot." *Rice v. Astrue*, 4:06-CV-02770-GRA, 2010 WL 3607474, at *2 (D.S.C. Sept. 9, 2010) (citing *Rbines v. Weber*, 544 U.S. 269 (2005) and *United States v. Franczak*, 8 F. App'x 246 (4th Cir. 2001)). Plaintiffs expect that they will file a petition for a writ of certiorari to the Fourth Circuit, asking the Supreme Court to reverse the Fourth Circuit's decision. Should the Court grant Plaintiffs' petition, the rulings upon which the the Duke Defendants rely in their Joint Motion may be, themselves, reversed or modified, rendering the Duke Defendants' Joint Motion moot.¹ Therefore, the proceedings on the Duke Defendants' Joint Motion should be held in abeyance until the outcome of Plaintiffs' anticipated petition for a writ of certiorari and any other related appellate proceedings are concluded.

In the alternative, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court order that Plaintiffs' response in opposition to the Duke Defendants' Joint Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings be extended for 60 days, so that the proceedings on the Joint Motion may, at least, take into account the issues raised in Plaintiffs' petition for a writ of certiorari.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Duke Defendants' Joint Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings should be held in abeyance pending resolution of Plaintiffs' petition for certiorari, or, in the alternative, for at least 60 days so that the briefing on the Joint Motion may take into account the issues raised in the petition.

¹ Moreover, even if the Fourth Circuit's decision were to stand, then Plaintiffs will explain why the Court should deny the Joint Motion as to Counts 18 and 32.

Respectfully submitted by:

EKSTRAND & EKSTRAND LLP *Counsel for Plaintiffs*

/s/ Robert C. Ekstrand

Robert C. Ekstrand, N.C. Bar No. 26673 110 Swift Avenue, Second Floor Durham, North Carolina 27705 RCE@ninthstreetlaw.com Tel. (919) 416-4590 Fax. (919) 416-4591

.

/s/ Stefanie Smith

Stefanie Smith, N.C. Bar No. 42345 110 Swift Avenue, Second Floor Durham, North Carolina 27705 SAS@ninthstreetlaw.com Tel. (919) 416-4590 Fax. (919) 416-4591

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

RYAN MCFADYEN, et al.,)
Plaintiffs,)
V.)
)
DUKE UNIVERSITY, et al.,)
Defendants.)

1:07-CV-953

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on March 25, 2013, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF System, which will send notice of the filing to counsel of record for all Defendants and Defendant Linwood Wilson, all of whom are registered CM/ECF users.

Respectfully submitted,

<u>/s/ Robert C. Ekstrand</u>. Robert C. Ekstrand, Counsel for Plaintiffs