

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 RALPH COLEMAN.

No. 2:90-cv-0520 KJM DB P

12 Plaintiff,

13 | v.

14 GAVIN NEWSOM, et al.,

## ORDER

15 Defendants.

17  
18 Defendants have filed a motion under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 67 for leave  
19 to deposit payments for the neutral expert in the court’s registry or, in the alternative under  
20 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b) to modify the court’s December 14, 2018 and January 8,  
21 2019 orders appointing the neutral expert, ECF Nos. 6033, 6064 (hereafter “appointment  
22 orders”). ECF No. 6121. The motion is noticed for hearing on May 16, 2019. *Id.*

23 Defendants also seek a stay of the payment provisions of the appointment orders  
24 pending ruling on the motion. Defendants' motion contains neither legal authority for nor  
25 analysis of their stay request. *See* ECF No. 6121, *passim*. "The proponent of a stay bears the  
26 burden of establishing its need." *Clinton v. Jones*, 520 U.S. 681, 708 (1997). Defendants "must  
27 make out a clear case of hardship or inequity in being required to go forward, if there is even a

1 fair possibility that the stay [they seek] will work damage to someone else." *Landis v. North*  
2 *American Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 255 (1936).

3 Defendants have not met their burden. Defendants have appealed the appointment  
4 orders to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, but they have not previously  
5 sought a stay of any aspect of those orders pending appeal. *See* ECF Nos. 6058, 6078. Their  
6 motion to deposit funds in the court's registry or to modify the payment provisions of the  
7 appointment orders is, in effect, a motion to stay payment of compensation to the neutral expert  
8 pending disposition of that appeal, *see* ECF No. 6121 at 9, and the request to stay orders for direct  
9 payment pending this court's resolution of that motion is an extension of that effort.

10 Different Rules of Procedure govern the power of district courts and  
11 courts of appeals to stay an order pending appeal. See Fed. Rule Civ.  
12 Proc. 62(c); Fed. Rule App. Proc. 8(a). Under both Rules, however,  
13 the factors regulating the issuance of a stay are generally the same:  
14 (1) whether the stay applicant has made a strong showing that he is  
likely to succeed on the merits; (2) whether the applicant will be  
irreparably injured absent a stay; (3) whether issuance of the stay will  
substantially injure the other parties interested in the proceeding; and  
15 (4) where the public interest lies.

16 *Hilton v. Braunschweil*, 481 U.S. 770, 776 (1987).

17 In the substance of the April 4, 2019 motion, defendants seek an order requiring  
18 them to deposit funds owed to the neutral expert into the court's registry, rather than paying the  
19 expert directly, pending disposition of their appeal. Defendants must make a showing that they  
20 will suffer "irreparable injury" if they are required to pay the neutral expert directly between now  
21 and the time this court rules on their motion. As noted above, defendants have made no showing  
22 of injury suffered during this time. Both the present request for stay and defendants' underlying  
23 motion are predicated only on alleged monetary injury which, without more "does not usually  
24 constitute irreparable injury.'" *Los Angeles Memorial Coliseum Commission v. National*  
25 *Football League*, 634 F.2d 1197, 1202 (9th Cir. 1980) (quoting *Sampson v. Murray*, 415 U.S. 61,  
26 90 (1974)). On the other hand, granting defendants' request for stay would require the neutral  
27 expert to work without compensation for at least two and a half months, from February 1, 2019  
28 through April 15, 2019, when the court currently expects to receive his report. *See* ECF No. 6033

1 at 3; ECF No. 6064 at 1 n.1. Defendants have made no showing that this court could impose such  
2 a requirement on the neutral expert and doing so would work a manifest injustice.

3 In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that defendants'  
4 request for a stay of orders requiring defendants to pay compensation directly to the neutral expert  
5 pending the court's ruling on their April 4, 2019 motion is DENIED. This resolves ECF No.  
6 6121 in part.

7 DATED: April 9, 2019.

8   
9 

---

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28