

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Oracle America, Inc. v. Procore Technologies, Inc.

No. 24-cv-07457-JST (N.D. Cal. Aug. 5, 2025) · No. 24-cv-07457-JST · Decided August 5, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California grants in part and denies in part Defendant Mark Mariano’s motion to stay proceedings pending his interlocutory appeal of the denial of his motion to compel arbitration. The Court stays Oracle’s claims against Mariano but declines to stay the claims against Procore, concluding that Oracle may suffer ongoing competitive harm and that a stay would not materially promote the orderly course of justice.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jon S. Tigar
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	August 5, 2025
DOCKET	24-cv-07457-JST
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant Mark Mariano moved to stay district court proceedings pending his interlocutory appeal from the denial of his motion to compel arbitration. He also sought a discretionary stay of Oracle's claims against the Procore defendants.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A stay pending an interlocutory appeal on arbitrability is mandatory. A discretionary stay of claims against nonappealing parties is evaluated under the Landis factors: potential damage from the stay, hardship or inequity absent a stay, and the orderly course of justice.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown
PARTIES	Mark Mariano v. Oracle America, Inc., Oracle International Corporation, Textura Corporation

TOPICS

- arbitration
- appellate procedure
- civil procedure
- trade secrets
- commercial litigation

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

arbitration

trade secret misappropriation

commercial litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court was required to stay Oracle's claims against Mariano while Mariano pursued an interlocutory appeal concerning arbitrability.
2. Whether the court should exercise its discretion to stay Oracle's claims against the Procore defendants pending Mariano's appeal.

HOLDINGS

1. A district court must stay its proceedings as to claims against a party while that party's interlocutory appeal on arbitrability is pending; therefore, the action was stayed as to Mariano.
2. A discretionary stay of Oracle's claims against Procore was not warranted because Oracle showed substantial potential competitive harm, Mariano did not show sufficient hardship or inequity absent a stay, and the appeal was unlikely to affect the orderly course of justice.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“[A] district court must stay its proceedings while the interlocutory appeal on arbitrability is ongoing.” (at 1)

“The burden is on the movant to show that a stay is appropriate.” (at 2)

“Without more, that risk does not require granting a stay.” (at 3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Oracle alleges that Mariano took Oracle trade secrets when he left Oracle to work for competitor Procore. Oracle further alleges that Mariano and Procore used the trade secrets to develop a competing product, which Oracle discovered after the product launched. Oracle alleged that Procore continued to market and sell the product, creating ongoing competitive harm.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Oracle sued Procore Technologies, Inc., Procore Payment Services, Inc., and Mark Mariano for trade-secret misappropriation, breach of contract, and unjust enrichment. Mariano moved to compel arbitration and stay the proceedings, or alternatively to dismiss; Procore separately moved to stay or dismiss. The district court denied those motions, Mariano appealed the arbitration ruling, and then moved for a stay pending appeal. The court granted a stay as to Oracle's claims against Mariano but denied a discretionary stay as to the Procore defendants.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Coinbase v. Bielski*, 599 U.S. 736, 740 (2023)
- *Lockyer v. Mirant Corp.*, 398 F.3d 1098, 1110 (9th Cir. 2005)
- *CMAX, Inc. v. Hall*, 300 F.2d 265, 268 (9th Cir. 1962)
- *Clinton v. Jones*, 520 U.S. 681, 708 (1997)
- *United Comm'ns Hub, Inc. v. Qwest Comm'ns, Inc.*, 46 Fed. App'x 412, 415 (9th Cir. 2002)
- *Pandolfi v. Aviagames, Inc.*, No. 23-cv-05971-EMC, 2024 WL 4951258, at *1, *6, *18 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 3, 2024)
- *Avery v. TekSystems, Inc.*, 757 F. Supp. 3d 973, 978 (N.D. Cal. 2024)
- *Ireland-Gordy v. Tile, Inc.*, No. 3:23-cv-04119-RFL, Dkt. 89 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 25, 2025)
- *Cal. Crane Sch., Inc. v. Google, LLC*, 621 F. Supp. 3d 1024, 1033-34 (N.D. Cal. 2022)