- 1	
1	Patty A. Ferguson-Bohnee (AZ 020996)
	Patty.Ferguson@SacksTierney.com
2	Judith M. Dworkin (AZ 010849)
	Judith.Dworkin@SacksTierney.com
3	Joe W. Keene (AZ 032623)
_	Joe.Keene@sackstierney.com
4	SACKS TIERNEY P.A.
٠ ا	4250 N. Drinkwater Blvd., 4th Floor
5	Scottsdale, AZ 85251-3693
١ -	Telephone: 480.425.2600
6	1
١	Paul Spruhan (NM 12513)
7	pspruhan@nndoj.org
′	Navajo Nation Dept. of Justice
8	P.O. Drawer 2010
0	Window Rock, Arizona 86515
9	Telephone: (928) 871-6210
7	Facsimile: (928) 871-6177
10	Attorneys for Plaintiffs
10 1	1

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

The Navajo Nation, et al.,	No. CV-18-08329-PCT-DWL
Plaintiffs,	IOINT MOTION FOR A
v.	JOINT MOTION FOR A TEMPORARY STAY OF
Katie Hobbs, et. al.,	PROCEEDINGS (SECOND REQUEST)
Defendants.	

Through undersigned counsel, the Parties hereby jointly request a 100 day extension of the May 2, 2019 deadline (Doc. 36) staying this proceeding to allow for continued settlement negotiations so that the Parties can work on a potential settlement to the underlying lawsuit. Since this lawsuit has been filed, the Parties have been engaged in settlement discussions and want to continue these productive discussions.

The Parties agree that it is in the best interest of judicial economy and conservation of the Court's and Parties' resources to allow for settlement discussions and the possibility of settlement before setting any Proposed Scheduling Order. A 100-day extension will

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

allow the Parties to continue settlement discussions and potentially complete a settlement. If, at the end of the 100-day period, the Parties determine that settlement discussions are not productive, the Parties will submit to the Court a Notice that settlement will not happen and will then file within 10 days a Proposed Scheduling Order.

This Court has the inherent authority to stay this matter. "The District Court has broad discretion to stay proceedings incident to its power to control its own docket." Clinton v. Jones, 520 U.S. 681, 706 (1997). "[T]he power to stay proceedings is incidental to the power inherent in every court to control the disposition of the causes 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). And because this motion is submitted jointly by the Parties, there is no potential prejudice to either party if the stay is granted.

WHEREFORE, the Parties request that the Court grant the attached proposed Order staying the proceedings in the litigation for 100 days, to allow the Parties to engage in settlement discussions in order to resolve this matter.

Respectfully submitted this 23rd day of April, 2019.

SACKS TIERNEY P.A.

By: s/Patty A. Ferguson-Bohnee
Patty A. Ferguson-Bohnee
Judith M. Dworkin
Joe Keene
and
Paul Spruhan
NAVAJO NATION DEPARTMENT OF
JUSTICE
Attorneys for the Plaintiffs
Mark Brnovich
Attorney General
Rv. s/ Iosanh F. La Rua

Joseph E. La Rue

Assistant Attorney General

Attorney for Defendant Arizona Secretary of State Katie Hobbs

/s/ Jason S. Moore Jason S. Moore **Deputy County Attorney** Attorneys for Doris Clark and Rayleen **Richards**

WILLIAM P. RING Coconino County Attorney

By: s/Rose Winkeler Rose Winkeler **Deputy County Attorney** Attorneys for Coconino County

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on April 23, 2019, I electronically transmitted the foregoing JOINT MOTION TO STAY PROCEEDINGS to the Clerk's Office using the CM/ECF System for filing.

s/Rebecca C. Urias