

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

Kathryn A. Richardson, Trustee for the Kathryn A. Bilski Revocable Trust, et al. v. Siddharth Jawahar, et al.

Richardson v. Jawahar · No. Civil Action No. 25-1135-CFC-SRF · Decided February 17, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Delaware denied without prejudice pro se defendant Siddharth Jawahar’s motion to stay a civil securities-fraud action pending criminal proceedings. The court concluded that Jawahar’s guilty plea to three counts of wire fraud mooted the asserted basis for the requested stay and directed that any objections be filed under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(a).

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Delaware
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Delaware
DECIDED	February 17, 2026
DOCKET	Civil Action No. 25-1135-CFC-SRF
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Pro se defendant Siddharth Jawahar moved to stay a pending civil securities-fraud action for twelve months based on the potential prejudice to his Fifth Amendment rights from simultaneously defending the civil case and a criminal prosecution.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The district court has broad discretion in deciding whether to stay a civil action pending resolution of a criminal matter.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown

TOPICS

civil procedure commercial litigation fifth amendment criminal procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure securities litigation criminal procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the civil securities-fraud action should be stayed for twelve months because proceeding with the civil action could prejudice Jawahar's Fifth Amendment rights in his criminal case.
2. Whether Jawahar's guilty plea rendered moot the asserted basis for staying the civil action.

HOLDINGS

1. A district court has broad discretion to decide whether to stay a civil case pending resolution of a criminal matter and generally considers the overlap between the civil and criminal issues, the status of the criminal proceedings, the plaintiff's interest in expeditious proceedings and potential prejudice, the burden on defendants, the interests of the court, and the public interest.
2. Jawahar's guilty plea mooted the asserted basis for his requested stay because the motion was premised on the risk that proceeding with the civil action would prejudice his Fifth Amendment rights in the criminal proceeding.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"In deciding whether to stay a civil case pending the resolution of a criminal matter, courts generally consider: "(1) the extent to which the issues in the civil and criminal cases overlap; (2) the status of the criminal proceedings, including whether any defendants have been indicted; (3) the plaintiff's interest in expeditious civil proceedings weighed against the prejudice to the plaintiff caused by the delay; (4) the burden on the defendants; (5) the interests of the court; and (6) the public interest." (¶ 3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiffs allege that Jawahar and other defendants participated in an investment-fraud or Ponzi scheme involving the Swiftarc investment entities, and they seek damages, disgorgement, and other relief. Jawahar was indicted in the Eastern District of Missouri on December 20, 2023, in connection with criminal proceedings arising during the pendency of the civil case. He entered a guilty plea to three counts of wire fraud on January 21, 2026, shortly after filing his motion to stay.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs originally filed the civil action in the Northern District of Ohio on June 7, 2024. The action was transferred to the District of Delaware on September 11, 2025, and plaintiffs filed a first amended complaint on November 14, 2025. Jawahar moved to stay the civil action while criminal proceedings against him were pending, but he entered a guilty plea to three counts of wire fraud on January 21, 2026. The court denied the motion to stay without prejudice, stating that the guilty plea mooted the asserted basis for the requested stay.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Dentsply Int'l Inc. v. Kerr Mfg. Co., 734 F. Supp. 656, 658 (D. Del. 1990)

- *Maloney v. Gordon*, 328 F. Supp. 2d 508, 511 (D. Del. 2004)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-delaware/2026/kathryn-a-richardson-trustee-for-the-kathryn-a-bilski-4i8kz7f4>