

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Ronald William Ward v. S. Batra, et al.

Ward v. Batra · No. 1:21-cv-00929-KES-SKO (PC) · Decided November 3, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California vacated the existing discovery and scheduling order and temporarily stayed proceedings in Ronald William Ward’s civil rights action against S. Batra and others. The stay was imposed to allow the court to resolve pending motions and conserve judicial resources, while permitting limited opposition and reply briefing concerning two recently filed motions. The court also prohibited additional motions or briefing until the stay is lifted.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Sheila K. Oberto
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	November 3, 2025
DOCKET	1:21-cv-00929-KES-SKO (PC)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court, acting sua sponte in a pending 42 U.S.C. § 1983 civil-rights action, vacated the existing discovery and scheduling order and temporarily stayed proceedings while it resolved seven pending motions.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Abuse-of-discretion principles govern a district court's decision to stay proceedings; the court exercises sound discretion after weighing the competing interests affected by a stay.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished, nonprecedential district court order

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- discovery dispute
- prisoners rights
- civil rights
- section 1983

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights
- prisoner civil-rights litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should vacate the existing discovery and scheduling order because multiple pending motions required resolution before further deadlines could be enforced.
2. Whether the court should sua sponte impose a temporary stay of proceedings and restrict additional motions and briefing pending resolution of the pending motions.

HOLDINGS

1. The court may vacate the existing discovery and scheduling order to permit resolution of numerous pending motions and reset the deadline for pretrial dispositive motions afterward.
2. A district court may sua sponte stay proceedings as an incident of its inherent authority to control its docket when, after weighing the relevant interests, the stay promotes judicial economy and does not create undue harm or hardship.
3. During the temporary stay, the parties may file only the opposition and reply briefing expressly permitted by the order and may not file additional motions, requests, or briefing until the stay is lifted.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Court’s limited resources are overburdened.” (at 2)

“The exertion of this power calls for the exercise of sound discretion.” (at 2)

“Generally, stays should not be indefinite in nature” (at 3)

“In sum, the Court finds a temporary stay of these proceeding is warranted.” (at 4)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The action proceeds on Plaintiff’s Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim concerning serious medical needs. Since mid-July 2025, Plaintiff filed seven motions, several of which Defendant opposed or had not yet had an opportunity to oppose. Discovery had concluded, the matter had not been set for trial, and the court was managing a backlog of motions.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff Ronald William Ward, a pro se civil detainee proceeding in forma pauperis, brought an Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim against Defendant Batra. The court had issued a discovery and scheduling order setting a discovery cutoff and a dispositive-motion deadline. After Plaintiff filed seven motions, the court vacated the scheduling order and stayed the action pending resolution of the motions, while permitting limited opposition and reply briefing.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Clinton v. Jones, 520 U.S. 681, 706 (1997)
- Landis v. North American Co., 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936)
- CMAX, Inc. v. Hall, 300 F.2d 265, 268 (9th Cir. 1962)
- Ali v. Trump, 241 F. Supp. 3d 1147, 1152 (W.D. Wash. 2017)
- Dependable Highway Exp., Inc. v. Navigators Ins. Co., 498 F.3d 1059, 1066-67 (9th Cir. 2007)
- Hart v. Weyrich, No. 2:23-cv-884, 2023 WL 5015616, at *1-2 (W.D. Wash. Aug. 7, 2023)
- Hill v. Payne, No. 6:21-cv-6029, 2022 WL 22017673, at *3 (W.D. Ark. Feb. 18, 2022)
- Liberi v. Taitz, No. SACV 11-0485 AG (AJWx), 2011 WL 13143549, at *5 (C.D. Cal. June 14, 2011)
- Linear Technology Corp. v. Impala Linear Corp., No. C-98-1727 VRW, 2001 WL 36126932, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 21, 2001)
- Cole v. Xlibris Corp., No. 1:05 CV 303 M D (N.D. Miss. Apr. 12, 2006)