

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DONALD J. TRUMP, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
FACEBOOK INC., et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 21-cv-09044-JSW

**ORDER STAYING MATTER PENDING
FINAL DISPOSITION OF *TWITTER*
AND STRIKING PENDING MOTIONS
WITHOUT PREJUDICE**

The Court has reviewed the parties’ responses to this Court’s order to show cause why the Court in its discretion should not stay this matter pending final disposition of the appeal of the dismissal of *Donald Trump, et al. v. Twitter, et al.*, N.D. Cal. Case No. 21-cv-08378-JD (Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals Case. No. 22-15961) (“*Twitter*”).

“[T]he power to stay proceedings is incidental to the power inherent in every court to control disposition of the cases on its docket with economy of time and effort for itself, for counsel, and for litigants.” *Landis v. N. Am. Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936). “The exertion of this power calls for the exercise of sound discretion.” *CMAX, Inc. v. Hall*, 300 F.2d 265, 268 (9th Cir. 1962). The competing interests that a district court must weigh in deciding whether to grant a stay include: (1) “possible damage which may result from granting a stay, (2) the hardship or inequity which a party may suffer in being required to go forward, and (3) the orderly course of justice measured in terms of the simplifying or complicating of issues, proof, and questions of law which could be expected to result from a stay.” *Id.* (citing *Landis*, 299 U.S. at 254-55).

