

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AUSTIN DIVISION

FIREDISC, INC., et al.,	§	NO. 1:25-CV-1134-DAE
	§	
<i>Plaintiffs,</i>	§	
	§	
vs.	§	
	§	
DONALD J. TRUMP, et al.,	§	
	§	
<i>Defendants.</i>	§	
_____	§	

ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO STAY

Before the Court is Defendants’ Opposed Motion to Stay Proceedings Pending Disposition of Defendants’ Motion to Transfer, filed on July 28, 2025. (Dkt. # 10.) Plaintiffs filed a Response on August 4, 2025. (Dkt. # 11.) Defendants replied on August 5, 2025. (Dkt. # 13.) On September 3, 2025, Defendants filed a Notice of Supplemental Authority. (Dkt. # 19.) Plaintiffs responded on September 10, 2025. (Dkt. # 23.)

On September 9, 2025, the Supreme Court granted certiorari in two parallel cases, V.O.S. Selections, Inc., et al. v. Donald J. Trump, et al., No. 2025-1812, 2025 WL 2490634 (Fed. Cir. Aug. 29, 2025), *cert. granted*, 2025 WL 2601020 (U.S. Sept. 9, 2025) (No. 25-250), and Learning Res., Inc., et al. v. Donald J. Trump, et al., No. 25-1248, 2025 WL 1525376 (D.D.C. May 29, 2025),

cert. granted before judgment, 2025 WL 2601021 (U.S. Sept. 9, 2025) (No. 24-1287). In both cases, the petitioners ask the Supreme Court to rule on the question, in slightly different variations, of whether the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (“IEEPA”) authorizes the President to impose tariffs. *Petition for a Writ of Certiorari* at (I), V.O.S. Selections, 2025 WL 2490634 (No. 25-250); *Petition for a Writ of Certiorari Before Judgment* at (i), Learning Resources, 2025 WL 1525376 (No. 24-1287).

The Petitioners in Learning Resources further ask the Supreme Court to determine whether the federal district courts or the United States Court of International Trade have jurisdiction over the cases. *Letter from Petitioners* at 1–2, Learning Resources, 2025 WL 1525376 (No. 24-1287). The Supreme Court stated that both cases will be set for oral arguments in the first week of November. V.O.S. Selections, Inc., et al., 2025 WL 2601020; Learning Resources, 2025 WL 2601021.


A Federal court has the inherent power to stay proceedings in the interest of judicial economy. See Landis v. N. Am. Co., 299 U.S. 248, 254–55 (1936). Accordingly, the Court finds that a stay on the proceedings in this case is

appropriate until the Supreme Court issues its ruling in V.O.S. Selections and Learning Resources.¹

The Court therefore **GRANTS** Defendants' Motion to Stay.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that this case be stayed, and all further proceedings be abated until further ordered by the Court.

DATED: Austin, Texas, September 11, 2025.



David Alan Ezra
Senior United States District Judge

¹ The Court previously ordered Defendants to respond to Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment on or before September 23, 2025. (Dkt. # 17.) In light of the Supreme Court's granting of certiorari, the Court has reconsidered its decision. Pursuant to this Order, the deadline for Defendants to submit their response to Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment is hereby stayed along with all other deadlines in this case.