

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

OPINION

Carbon Autonomous Robotic Systems Inc. v. Laudando & Assoc.

PER CURIAM.

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, 6514 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