

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

MARY TURNER; TYLER
CRUTCHFIELD,

Plaintiffs,

SHARI'S MANAGEMENT
CORPORATION; DOES 1-10,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:24-cv-05577

ORDER STAYING CASE

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiffs Mary Turner and Tyler Chfield's Motion to Stay Case. Dkt. No. 19. “[T]he power to stay proceedings is inherent to the power inherent in every court to control the disposition of the cases on its docket with economy of time and effort for itself, for counsel, and for litigants.” *Landis v. N. Am. Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936). In determining whether a stay is appropriate, the Court must weigh various interests, including: (1) the probable damage to result from granting the stay; (2) the hardship to the parties if suit proceeds; and (3) the “orderly course of justice measured in terms of the simplifying or complicating of issues, proof, and questions of law which could be

ORDER STAYING CASE - 1

1 expected to result from a stay.” *Lockyer v. Mirant Corp.*, 398 F.3d 1098, 1110 (9th
2 Cir. 2005).

3 Here, the interests of the parties, of the Court, and of justice warrant a stay.
4 According to Plaintiffs, Defendant Shari’s Management Corporation (“Shari’s”) has
5 been non-cooperative and non-responsive throughout litigation; did not attend the
6 Parties’ scheduled mediation; is “experiencing significant financial difficulties,
7 including adverse judgments and operational challenges”; and “may be on the verge
8 of filing for bankruptcy.” Dkt. No. 19 at 2–3. Plaintiffs state that “[a]llowing the
9 case to proceed without Defendant’s cooperation or participation would prejudice
10 Plaintiffs by delaying resolution and increasing litigation costs” and that “[a] stay
11 allows the parties and the Court to await clarity regarding Defendant’s financial
12 and legal status.” *Id.* at 4. Plaintiffs further state that given “the strong likelihood”
13 that Shari’s will file for bankruptcy, “it is prudent to stay this case preemptively to
14 avoid unnecessary motion practice or procedural complications.” *Id.* Shari’s does not
15 oppose the motion to stay. *See* Dkt.; *see also* LCR 7(b)(2) (“[I]f a party fails to file
16 papers in opposition to a motion, such failure may be considered by the court as an
17 admission that the motion has merit.”). Indeed, no party indicates that a stay will
18 cause hardship.

19 Accordingly, Plaintiffs’ motion to stay the case is GRANTED, and this case is
20 STAYED. Dkt. No. 19. The Court ORDERS the parties to submit a Joint Status
21 Report (JSR) every NINETY (90) days, throughout the duration of the stay,
22 informing the Court about any relevant updates, including information, if any,
23 regarding bankruptcy proceedings involving Shari’s. If Shari’s remains non-

1 responsive and therefore unavailable to participate in the JSR, Plaintiffs should say
2 so in their submission(s) to the Court.

3 It is so ORDERED.

4 Dated this 5th day of March, 2025.

5 

6 Jamal N. Whitehead
7 United States District Judge

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23