

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

**Carbon Autonomous Robotic Systems Inc. v. Laudando & Associates
LLC**

No. 2:24-cv-03012-DAD-JDP (E.D. Cal. June 17, 2025) · No. 2:24-cv-03012-DAD-JDP · Decided June 18,
2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California granted the plaintiff’s motion to stay the action while the corporate defendant obtained substitute counsel. The court stayed the case through July 1, 2025, vacated all other dates and deadlines, and directed the parties to file a joint status report by July 16, 2025.

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 CARBON AUTONOMOUS ROBOTIC No. 2:24-cv-03012-DAD-JDP
SYSTEMS INC., 12 Plaintiff, 13 ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION v. TO STAY
THIS ACTION 14 LAUDANDO & ASSOCIATES LLC, (Doc. No. 78) 15 Defendant. 16 17
LAUDANDO & ASSOCIATES LLC, 18 Counter Claimant, 19 v. 20 CARBON AUTONOMOUS
ROBOTIC 21 SYSTEMS INC., 22 Counter Defendant.

23 24 This matter is before the court on plaintiff’s motion to stay this action while defendant 25
obtains substitute counsel. (Doc. No. 78.) Specifically, plaintiff contends that a stay is 26
appropriate because under the court’s scheduling order as modified (Doc. Nos. 37, 55-1, 56), it is
27 required to serve a disclosure of asserted claims and infringement contentions by June 20,
2025, 28 //// 1 but—because defendant Laudando & Associates LLC is currently unrepresented
—“there is 2 nobody on whom to serve such contentions and documents.” (Doc.

No. 78-1 at 2.) 3 “[T]he power to stay proceedings is incidental to the power inherent in every
court to 4 control the disposition of the causes on its docket with economy of time and effort for
itself, for 5 counsel, and for litigants.” Landis v. N. Am. Co., 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936); accord
Stone v. INS, 6 514 U.S. 386, 411 (1995) (Breyer, J., dissenting) (“[W]e have long recognized that
courts have 7 inherent power to stay proceedings and ‘to control the disposition of the causes on
its docket with 8 economy of time and effort for itself, for counsel, and for litigants.’”) (quoting
Landis, 299 U.S. 9 at 254); Ernest Bock, LLC v. Steelman, 76 F.4th 827, 842 (9th Cir.

2023). Deciding whether to 10 grant a stay pending the outcome of other proceedings “calls for the exercise of judgment, which 11 must weigh competing interests and maintain an even balance.” Landis, 299 U.S. at 254–55. 12 In considering whether to grant a stay, this court must weigh several factors, including 13 “[1] the possible damage which may result from the granting of a stay, [2] the hardship or 14 inequity which a party may suffer in being required to go forward, and [3] the orderly course of 15 justice measured in terms of the simplifying or complicating of issues, proof, and questions of law 16 which could be expected to result from a stay.” CMAX, Inc. v. Hall, 300 F.2d 265, 268 (9th Cir.

17 1962) (citing Landis, 299 U.S. at 254–55); see also Ernest Bock, LLC, 76 F.4th at 842. A stay 18 may be granted regardless of whether the separate proceedings are “judicial, administrative, or 19 arbitral in character, and does not require that the issues in such proceedings are necessarily 20 controlling of the action before the court.” Leyva v. Certified Grocers of Cal., Ltd., 593 F.2d 857, 21 864 (9th Cir.

1979). 22 The court concludes that the possible damage which may result from the granting of a stay 23 here is minimal in light of defendant currently lacking representation. Furthermore, the court 24 concludes that “the orderly course of justice,” CMAX, 300 F.2d at 268, and considerations of 25 “economy of time and effort for [the court], for counsel, and for litigants,” Landis, 299 U.S. at 26 254, weigh strongly in favor of staying this action given that defendant is not otherwise able to 27 proceed in this matter without counsel.

See L.R. 183(a); see also Abercrombie v. Vestra Labs 28 // 1 LLC, No. 2:23-cv-01529-KJM-AC, ECF No. 21 (staying action where the corporate defendant 2 | was unrepresented to permit the defendant to obtain substitute counsel). 3 Accordingly, plaintiff's motion to stay this action (Doc. No. 78) is granted. This action 1s 4 | STAYED through July 1, 2025, to permit defendant to obtain substitute counsel by the deadline 5 | previously set by the court.

(Doc. No. 75.) The stay will lift automatically on July 2, 2025 6 | without a further order of this court. The court directs the parties to file a joint status report 7 | regarding further scheduling by July 16, 2025. All other dates and deadlines are vacated. 8 IT IS SO ORDERED. | Dated: _ June 17, 2025 Dae A. 2, eyel 10 DALE A. DROZD UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28