

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

No. 25-1738

Filed: January 21, 2026

MARYLAND CLEAN ENERGY)
CENTER, <i>et al.</i> ,)
)
Plaintiffs,)
)
v.)
)
THE UNITED STATES,)
)
Defendant.)

ORDER

On December 9, 2025, defendant filed a Motion to Stay all proceedings in this matter. *See* ECF No. 50. Defendant represented that a stay was appropriate because plaintiffs filed a related action in the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington. *Id.* at 2–5; *see Arizona, et al. v. EPA*, No. 2:25-cv-02015 (W.D. Wash. Oct. 16, 2025). According to defendant, a stay would promote judicial economy because a final order from the district court would subsume the relief sought by plaintiffs in this case, and it would also prevent defendant from facing conflicting orders and judgments. ECF No. 50, at 4–6. Plaintiffs opposed the stay and contested that the issues before the district court “are independent from whether Defendants breached their contracts with Plaintiffs.” ECF No. 56, at 3. Additionally, plaintiffs cautioned that a stay would cause unnecessary delay and harm plaintiffs if the Court waited for the disposition of the district court litigation. *Id.* at 3–4.

To resolve these issues, the Court held oral argument on January 21, 2026. From the bench, the Court hereby **GRANTS** defendant’s motion, ECF No. 50, and imposes a **STAY** on all proceedings until **April 21, 2026**. At the same time, the parties are directed to file a status report on or before **April 13, 2026**. Plaintiffs’ status report should apprise the Court of the progress in the federal district court litigation. Defendant’s status report should advise the Court of what steps it must take to proceed in this case. Once the Court receives the parties’ materials, it will then determine whether litigation should resume in this matter or if the stay should be extended for another three months.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ *Loren A. Smith*

Loren A. Smith,
Senior Judge