judgment, declaring California Penal Code section 32310 unconstitutional and
enjoining its enforcement. ECF. No. 87. Minutes later, the Court entered a final
judgment in this case. ECF. No. 88. On April 4, 2019, the Attorney General filed a
notice of appeal to the Ninth Circuit. ECF No. 96. Later that day, this Court stayed
in part the judgment pending final resolution of the appeal. ECF No. 97. The filing
of the notice of appeal notwithstanding, Plaintiffs' bill of costs and motion for
attorneys' fees is currently due on April 12, 2019. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(d)(2)(B).
Under FRCP 54(d), a claim for attorneys' fees and costs must be filed no
later than 14 days after the entry of judgment, "[u]nless a statute or a court order
provides otherwise." A district court may, however, defer litigation of attorneys'
face and costs until a panding appeal has been decided See Fed D. Civ. D. 54 emt

later than 14 days after the entry of judgment, "[u]nless . . . a statute or a court order provides otherwise." A district court may, however, defer litigation of attorneys' fees and costs until a pending appeal has been decided. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 54 cmt. (1993 amend.) ("If an appeal on the merits of the case is taken, the court may rule on the claim for fees, may defer its ruling on the motion, or may deny the motion without prejudice, directing under subdivision (d)(2)(B) a new period for filing after the appeal has been resolved."). As this language suggests, the decision to stay costs and fees litigation "is a matter within the court's discretion." *Lasic v. Moreno*, No. 05-0161, 2007 WL 4180655, at \*1 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 21, 2007) (citing *Ass'n of Mex.-Am. Educs. v. California*, 231 F.3d 572, 591-92 (9th Cir. 2000)).

Here, granting the requested stay would preserve judicial resources, the Parties' resources, and allow the parties to focus on preparing the merits appeal for the Ninth Circuit. Litigating the issue of attorneys' fees and costs now would require the Court and the Parties to expend resources that may be wasted in the event the Attorney General succeeds on appeal. *See e.g.*, *Lasic* 2007 WL 4180655, at \*2-3 (finding that it was in the interests of judicial economy, to defer ruling on attorneys' fees and costs until the pending appeal was disposed). Indeed, "[i]t would be an inefficient use of judicial resources to rule on [costs and fees] at this time, and then to later re-evaluate the issue after the appeal is completed." *Id.* 

The Parties thus agree that good cause exists for an order staying litigation of

1	attorneys' fees and costs during the pendency of the Attorney General's appeal of		
2	this Court's judgment. And, based on that good cause, the Parties request that the		
3	Court grant this joint motion for an order staying all proceedings regarding		
4	attorneys' fees or costs in this action until 30 days after the completion of all		
5	appellate proceedings.		
6			
7	Dated: April 12, 2019	MICHEL & ASSOCIATES, P.C.	
8		/s/ Anna M. Barvir	
9		Anna M. Barvir Attorneys for Plaintiffs Virginia Duncan, Richard Lewis, Patrick	
10		Lovette, David Marguglio, Christopher Waddell, and California	
11		Rifle & Pistol Association	
12	Dated: April 12, 2019	XAVIER BECERRA	
13		Attorney General of California MARK R. BECKINGTON	
14		Supervising Deputy Attorney General Anthony P. O'Brien	
15		Deputy Attorney General	
16		/s/ John D. Echeverria John D. Echeverria	
17		Deputy Attorney General	
18		Attorneys for Defendant Attorney General Xavier Becerra	
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
		3	

Case 3:17-cv-01017-BEN-JLB Document 100 Filed 04/12/19 PageID.8229 Page 4 of 4