

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

Frank Krasovec and Zohar Ziv v. Siddharth Jawahar

Krasovec v. Jawahar · No. 25-1275-CFC-SRF · Decided February 17, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Delaware denied without prejudice defendant Siddharth Jawahar’s motion to stay a breach-of-contract and indemnification action pending resolution of related criminal proceedings. The court concluded that Jawahar’s guilty plea mooted the asserted Fifth Amendment basis for a stay and that plaintiffs had not shown sufficient grounds for an alternative stay pending motions to dismiss in a related action. The order was issued under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A), Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(a), and the District of Delaware Local Rules.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Delaware
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Sherry R. Fallon
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Delaware
DECIDED	February 17, 2026
DOCKET	25-1275-CFC-SRF
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court considered Defendant Siddharth Jawahar's motion to stay the civil action pending resolution of his criminal proceedings, as well as Plaintiffs' alternative request to stay the action pending resolution of motions to dismiss in a related civil case.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A district court has broad discretion in deciding whether to stay a civil action.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential memorandum order
PARTIES	Frank Krasovec, Zohar Ziv v. Siddharth Jawahar

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- fifth amendment
- motions to dismiss
- breach of contract
- commercial litigation

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- contracts
- commercial litigation
- criminal procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the civil action should be stayed for twelve months pending resolution of Defendant's criminal proceedings based on the asserted risk that proceeding would prejudice his Fifth Amendment rights.
2. Whether the civil action should be stayed pending resolution of Plaintiffs' motions to dismiss in the related Richardson Action.

HOLDINGS

1. A stay of the civil action was unwarranted because Defendant's subsequent guilty plea mooted the asserted Fifth Amendment basis for the requested stay.
2. A pending motion to dismiss does not justify staying litigation absent well-founded reasons supporting a stay; Plaintiffs' alternative request was therefore denied without prejudice.

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.”” (¶ 4)

“A pending motion to dismiss does not support a stay of the litigation absent well-founded reasons for staying the case.” (¶ 6)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiffs alleged that they invested money with Defendant and solicited funds from other potential investors on his behalf beginning in January 2019. After learning of a Texas State Securities Board disciplinary order against Defendant, Plaintiffs entered into an Omnibus Agreement concerning divestment and protection of investments, and they alleged that Defendant failed to comply with that agreement. Plaintiffs also sought indemnification for lost investments, legal fees, and expenses arising from claims asserted by other investors in a related action. Defendant sought a stay based on his criminal proceedings, but he entered a guilty plea to three wire-fraud counts shortly after filing the motion.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs filed this breach-of-contract and indemnification action in the Middle District of Tennessee on April 5, 2024. The action was pending while Defendant faced criminal proceedings in the Eastern District of Missouri; Defendant was indicted, later pleaded guilty to three counts of wire fraud, and then sought a twelve-month stay. The action was before the District of Delaware when the court denied both Defendant's stay request and Plaintiffs' alternative stay request without prejudice.

DISPOSITION

other

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

No remand. Defendant's motion to stay and Plaintiffs' alternative request to stay pending resolution of motions to dismiss in the Richardson Action were both denied without prejudice.

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)
- Richardson, et al. v. Jawahar, et al.

OPINION

Krasovec

PER CURIAM.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

FRANK KRASOVEC and ZOHAR ZIV,)

Plaintiffs, v. Civil Action No. 25-1275-CFC-SRF

SIDDHARTH JAWAHAR,

Defendant.

MEMORANDUM ORDER

At Wilmington this 17th day of February, 2026, the court having considered pro se defendant Siddharth Jawahar's ("Jawahar") motion to stay, (D.I. 25), and the briefing associated therewith (D.I. 27),¹ IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Jawahar's motion to stay is DENIED without prejudice for the following reasons.

1. Background. Plaintiffs Frank Krasovec and Zohar Ziv (collectively, "Plaintiffs") brought this civil action for breach of contract and indemnification against Jawahar in the Middle District of Tennessee on April 5, 2024. (DI. 1) Plaintiffs contend that they became victims of Jawahar's investment scheme when they invested money with him and solicited funds from other potential investors on his behalf beginning in January of 2019. (/d. at 712) The complaint alleges that, once Plaintiffs became aware of a Texas State Securities Board Disciplinary Order (the "TSSB Order") issued against Jawahar, they entered into an Omnibus Agreement with him to fully divest him from some investments and to preserve and protect investors' investments. (Ud. at TJ 11, 13-14) ! Per the District of Delaware Local Rules, Jawahar's reply brief was due on or before February 5, 2026. To date, no reply brief has been filed. Accordingly, the court issues this ruling based on the papers submitted.

2. In the complaint, Plaintiffs contend that Jawahar failed to comply with the terms of the Omnibus Agreement. (/d. at J] 19-20) Plaintiffs also seek indemnification for their lost investments, substantial legal fees, and other expenses incurred in relation to claims asserted against Plaintiffs by Jawahar's other investors in related Civil Action No. 25-1135-CFC-SRF,

Richardson, et al. v. Jawahar, et al. (the “Richardson Action”). (id. at 16, 22-23; D.I. 27 at 2)

3. Jawahar has been subject to criminal proceedings in the Eastern District of

Missouri for the duration of this civil action. He was criminally indicted on December 20, 2023, and he recently entered a guilty plea to three counts of wire fraud on January 21, 2026, less than two weeks after he filed the pending motion to stay in the instant action. (D.I. 1 at 917; D.I. 25; 27, Ex. 1) In the motion, Jawahar seeks a twelve-month stay of this action pending resolution of his criminal proceedings. (D.I. 25) 4, Legal Standard. The district court has broad discretion in considering a motion to stay. See *Dentsply Int’l Inc. v. Kerr Mfg. Co.*, 734 F. Supp. 656, 658 (D. Del. 1990). 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.” *Maloney v. Gordon*, 328 F. Supp. 2d 508, 511 (D. Del. 2004).

5. Analysis. Jawahar requests a twelve-month stay of this action, arguing that he would be prejudiced in asserting his Fifth Amendment rights in his criminal proceeding if the civil action proceeds. (D.I. 106) Jawahar’s motion does not address the remaining stay factors. (/d.) As Plaintiffs note, Jawahar’s subsequent agreement to a guilty plea moots the asserted basis for the requested stay. (D.I. 27 at 3)

6. Nonetheless, Plaintiffs seek their own stay of this action until resolution of the pending motions to dismiss in the Richardson Action. (/d. at 2) In support, Plaintiffs contend that this civil action will be resolved if their motions to dismiss in the Richardson Action are granted. (/d. at 3) Plaintiffs provide no further analysis of the applicable stay factors. A pending motion to dismiss does not support a stay of the litigation absent well-founded reasons for staying the case. Consequently, Plaintiff’s alternative request for a stay is DENIED without prejudice. Conclusion. For the foregoing reasons, Jawahar’s motion to stay is DENIED without prejudice. (D.I. 25) Plaintiffs alternative request to stay pending resolution of the motions to dismiss in the Richardson Action is also DENIED without prejudice.

8. This Memorandum Order is filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A), Fed. R.

Civ. P. 72(a), and D. Del. LR 72.1(a)(2). The parties may serve and file specific written objections within fourteen (14) days after being served with a copy of this Memorandum Order. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a). The objections and responses to the objections are limited to ten (10) pages each.

9. The parties are directed to the court’s Standing Order For Objections Filed Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 72, dated March 7, 2022, a copy of which is available on the court’s website, www.ded.uscourts.gov.

PABRAN\RY EK

herry R. Fallon United States Magistrate Judge

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-delaware-united-states-district-court-for-the-distr/2026/frank-krasovec-and-zohar-ziv-v-siddharth-jawahar-bm6hm0m6>