

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
TEXAS, HOUSTON DIVISION

A.B., an individual, et al. v. Salesforce, Inc.

A.B. v. Salesforce · No. 4:20-CV-01254 · Decided April 2, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas denied Plaintiffs’ motion for reconsideration of an order staying the civil action against Salesforce, Inc. The Court held that 18 U.S.C. § 1595(b) requires the action to remain stayed during the pendency of a related criminal case and directed counsel to notify the Court within fourteen days of that case’s final adjudication.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Houston Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Andrew S. Hanen
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Houston Division
DECIDED	April 2, 2026
DOCKET	4:20-CV-01254
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiffs moved for reconsideration of the order staying the civil action under 18 U.S.C. §§ 1595(b) and 3509(k), and requested oral argument. The court denied the motion.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A motion for reconsideration may not be used to rehash rejected arguments; reconsideration was denied because plaintiffs presented no new arguments or evidence concerning the mandatory stay provision.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished federal district court order; nonprecedential
PARTIES	A.B., an individual, et al., Plaintiffs v. Salesforce, Inc., Defendant

TOPICS

- motion for reconsideration
- statutory interpretation
- plain meaning rule
- civil procedure
- criminal procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should reconsider its prior order staying the civil action under 18 U.S.C. § 1595(b).
2. Whether the plain language of 18 U.S.C. § 1595(b) requires the civil action to remain stayed during the pendency of a related criminal action.
3. Whether plaintiffs' renewed statutory-interpretation arguments warranted reconsideration despite the absence of new evidence or arguments.

HOLDINGS

1. The plain language of 18 U.S.C. § 1595(b) requires the court to stay the civil action during the pendency of a related criminal action when the statutory conditions are satisfied.
2. Reconsideration was not warranted because plaintiffs presented no new arguments or evidence and merely rehashed arguments previously rejected by the court.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“a motion for reconsideration may not be used to rehash rejected arguments.”

“While the Court recognizes that this mandatory stay will delay reaching finality in this civil action, the Court must adhere to the plain text of the statute.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The plaintiffs brought a civil action against Salesforce, Inc. that the court previously stayed because of a related criminal case, *United States v. Lacey*, pending in the District of Arizona. The prior stay order relied on 18 U.S.C. § 1595(b), which the court interpreted as requiring a stay while the related criminal matter remained pending. Plaintiffs moved for reconsideration but offered no new arguments or evidence bearing on the mandatory nature of the statutory stay.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On October 28, 2025, the court granted Salesforce's motion to stay the civil action pending a related criminal case, *United States v. Lacey*, No. 2:18-CR-00422 (D. Ariz.). Plaintiffs sought reconsideration, but the court found that they presented no new arguments or evidence and had merely repeated their prior statutory-interpretation arguments. The court denied reconsideration and directed counsel to notify it within fourteen days of the final adjudication of the *Lacey* case.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- United States v. Lacey, No. 2:18-CR-00422 (D. Ariz.)
- Doe 1-10 v. Fitzgerald, 102 F.4th 1089, 1098 (9th Cir. 2024)
- A.S. Salesforce, Inc., No. 3:23-CV-1039 (N.D. Tex. Oct. 21, 2025)
- LH. v. Salesforce, Inc., No. 8:24-CV-01678 (M.D. Fla. Dec. 1, 2025)
- G.G. v. Salesforce.com, Inc., 2026 WL 663407 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 10, 2026)
- LeClerc v. Webb, 419 F.3d 405, 412 n.13 (5th Cir. 2005)

OPINION

Southern District of Texas ENTERED IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT April 02, 2026 FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS Nathan Ochsner, Clerk HOUSTON DIVISION A.B., an individual, et al., § Plaintiffs,: VS. § CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:20-CV-01254 SALESFORCE, INC.,: Defendant.: § § ORDER Pending before this Court is the Plaintiffs' Motion for Reconsideration of Order Granting Stay and Request for Oral Argument (Doc.

No. 249). Defendant Salesforce, Inc. ("Salesforce") filed a response in opposition. (Doc. No. 250). The Court is also in receipt of Plaintiff D.R.'s Supplemental Authority in Support of Motion for Reconsideration (Doc. No. 251) and Salesforce's response (Doc. No. 251). Upon close review of the pleadings and relevant legal standards, the Motion for Reconsideration (Doc.

No. 249) is DENIED. On October 28, 2025, this Court granted Salesforce's Motion to Stay Proceedings Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §§ 1595(b) and 3509(k). (Doc. No. 247). The Court held that the plain language of 18 U.S.C. § 1595(b) required this Court to stay this civil action during the pendency of a related criminal case, United States v. Lacey, No. 2:18-CR-00422 (D.

Ariz.). See Doe 1-10 v. Fitzgerald, 102 F.4th 1089, 1098 (9th Cir. 2024) (holding that the stay is a "mandatory obligation" for the civil action if "(1) a criminal action or investigation is pending; (2) the criminal action arises "out of the same occurrence" as the civil action; and (3) the plaintiff in the civil action is the victim of an occurrence that is the same in the civil and criminal proceedings").

Other courts have held the same. See, e.g., A.S. Salesforce, Inc., No. 3:23-CV-1039 (N.D. Tex. Oct. 21, 2025) (Doc. No. 179); LH. v. Salesforce, Inc., No. 8:24-CV-01678 (M.D. Fl. Dec. 1, 2025) (Doc. No. 282); G.G. v. Salesforce.com, Inc., No. 20-C-2335, 2026 WL 663407 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 10, 2026).

In their Motion for Reconsideration, Plaintiffs do not bring forth any new arguments or evidence related to the mandatory clause in § 1595(b). Instead, Plaintiffs rehash the same statutory interpretation arguments that were initially presented to this Court, but as the Fifth Circuit has advised, "[a] motion for reconsideration may not be used to rehash rejected arguments." LeClerc v. Webb, 419 F.3d 405, 412 n.13 (5th Cir.

2005). While the Court recognizes that this mandatory stay will delay reaching finality in this civil action, the Court must adhere to the plain text of the statute. All counsel shall notify this Court within fourteen days of the final adjudication of the Lacey case.

For the reasons above and explained in the Court's previous order (Doc. No. 247), the Motion for Reconsideration (Doc. No. 249) is DENIED. It is so ordered. Signed on this the day of April 2026.
Andrew S. Hanen — '—s United States District Judge