

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

SOLUTIONS IN HOMETOWN
CONNECTIONS, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

KRISTI NOEM, *et al.*,

Defendants.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

Civil Action No. 25-cv-00885-LKG

Dated: June 11, 2025

STAY ORDER

On June 2, 2025, the Plaintiffs in the above-captioned civil matter filed a notice of appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, appealing the Court’s May 20, 2025, Order and corresponding Memorandum Opinion denying the Plaintiffs’ motion for preliminary injunction and APA stay. ECF No. 72. On June 10, 2025, the parties filed a joint motion to stay. ECF No. 75.

The Court has the inherent power to stay proceedings to achieve equity and to ensure the efficient management of its docket. *See Williford v. Armstrong World Indus., Inc.*, 715 F.2d 124, 127 (4th Cir. 1983). In deciding whether to stay a case, the Court exercises its judgment “to balance the various factors relevant to the expeditious and comprehensive disposition of the causes of action on the court’s docket.” *Maryland v. Universal Elections, Inc.*, 729 F.3d 370, 375 (4th Cir. 2013) (quoting *United States v. Ga. Pac. Corp.*, 562 F.2d 294, 296 (4th Cir. 1977)). And so, when deciding whether to stay a case, the Court considers: (1) “the interests of judicial economy,” (2) the “hardship and equity to the moving party” in the absence of a stay, and (3) the “potential prejudice to the non-moving party” in the event of a stay. *See, e.g., White v. Ally Fin., Inc.*, 969 F. Supp. 2d 451, 462 (S.D.W. Va. 2013) (internal citation omitted).

The Court is satisfied that a stay of proceedings is appropriate, because many of the issues to be resolved by the Fourth Circuit in the appeal of this Court’s May 20, 2025, Order overlap with the grounds on which the Defendants intend to move to dismiss the case. *See* ECF No. 75. And so, a stay of this case while the appeal is pending would promote judicial economy.

In light of the foregoing, and for good cause shown, the Court:

- (1) **GRANTS** the parties' joint motion for stay (ECF No. 75);
- (2) **STAYS** the above-captioned case, pending a decision by the Fourth Circuit in appellate case number 25-1640 on the Plaintiffs' appeal of this Court's May 20, 2025, Order and corresponding Memorandum Opinion; and
- (3) **DIRECTS** the parties to file a joint status report stating their respective views on how this matter should proceed within **10 days** of the entry of a decision by the Fourth Circuit.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Lydia Kay Griggsby
LYDIA KAY GRIGGSBY
United States District Judge