1		HONORABLE RONALD B. LEIGHTON
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA	
8	ROSEMERE NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION, et al.	CASE NO. C11-5213 RBL
10	Plaintiffs,	ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO LIFT STAY
11	v.	[Dkt. #56]
12	CLARK COUNTY et al.,	
13	Defendants.	
14	THIS MATTER is before the Court on Plaintiffs' (together "Rosemere") Motion to Lift	
15	Stay for Ruling on Partial Summary Judgment [Dkt. #56]. This Court imposed the stay in late	
16	Stay for Runnig on Fartial Summary Judgment [Di	ct. #56]. This Court imposed the stay in late
17	2011 [Dkt. #36], pending the outcome of state cou	-
		art appeals of proceedings before the Pollution
18	2011 [Dkt. #36], pending the outcome of state cou	art appeals of proceedings before the Pollution ended, with the exception of the County's
18 19	2011 [Dkt. #36], pending the outcome of state cou Control Hearings Board. Those proceedings have	art appeals of proceedings before the Pollution ended, with the exception of the County's
18 19 20	2011 [Dkt. #36], pending the outcome of state coulontrol Hearings Board. Those proceedings have pending petition for review at the Washington Supthe PCHB's decision in Rosemere's favor.	art appeals of proceedings before the Pollution ended, with the exception of the County's
117 118 119 120 121 122 122 131	2011 [Dkt. #36], pending the outcome of state coulontrol Hearings Board. Those proceedings have pending petition for review at the Washington Supthe PCHB's decision in Rosemere's favor. The case involves Clark County's municipe Ecology's 2007 Phase I Stormwater General Perm	ent appeals of proceedings before the Pollution ended, with the exception of the County's breme Court. The Court of Appeals affirmed al storm sewer system, and the Department of it for that system. Ecology subsequently
18 19 20 21	2011 [Dkt. #36], pending the outcome of state coulontrol Hearings Board. Those proceedings have pending petition for review at the Washington Supthe PCHB's decision in Rosemere's favor. The case involves Clark County's municip	enter appeals of proceedings before the Pollution ended, with the exception of the County's breme Court. The Court of Appeals affirmed al storm sewer system, and the Department of it for that system. Ecology subsequently g that the flow control policy was inadequate.

challenged that Agreed Order before the PCHB, claiming (among other things) that it was not compliant with the Clean Water Act. The PCHB's determination that the Agreed Order violated the Phase I permit and the Clean Water Act was affirmed by the Court of Appeals. While those proceedings were pending, Rosemere brought this federal case. It seeks to enforce the Phase I permit, and penalties. This Court stayed the proceedings pending the resolution of the state court action. Rosemere now asks the Court to lift the stay, arguing that the issues that the Supreme Court might review do not affect its claims or the County's defenses in this case. It argues that the PCHB's invalidation of the Agreed Order will not be overturned even if the Supreme Court accepts review. The County opposes the Motion, arguing that it would be premature to do so while the state Court proceeding continues. It asks the Court to continue to abstain from hearing this case under the Colorado River doctrine. See Colorado River Water Conservation Dist. v. United States, 424 U.S. 800, 817 (1976); see also Moses H. Cone Memorial Hosp. v. Mercury Constr. Corp., 460 U.S. 1, 19 (1983). Under Colorado River, considerations of "wise judicial administration, giving regard to conservation of judicial resources and comprehensive disposition of litigation" may justify the imposition of a stay. 424 U.S. at 817. "Exact parallelism" is not required; "it is enough if the

conservation of judicial resources and comprehensive disposition of litigation" may justify the imposition of a stay. 424 U.S. at 817. "Exact parallelism" is not required; "it is enough if the two proceedings are 'substantially similar." *Holder v.* Holder, 305 F.3d 854, 867 (9th Cir. 2002) (quoting *Nakash*, 882 F.2d at 1416).

Following *Colorado River* and *Moses Cone*, the Court considers the following factors to determine if a stay is appropriate: (1) whether either court has assumed jurisdiction over a *res*; (2) the relative convenience of the forums; (3) the desirability of avoiding piecemeal litigation;

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	(4) the order in which the forums obtained jurisdiction; (5) whether state or federal law controls;
2	and (6) whether the state proceeding is adequate to protect the parties' rights. See Nakash, 882
3	F.2d at 1415 (citing <i>Colorado River</i> , 424 U.S. at 818 and <i>Moses Cone</i> , 460 U.S. at 25-26).
4	The County argues that factor Nos. 3 and 4 still support the stay, and ask the Court to
5	avoid piecemeal litigation by continuing the stay.
6	The issues in these cases were never overlapping; they were simply similar. That
7	similarity has been greatly diminished in the aftermath of the Court of Appeals' decision, and the
8	limitation of the issues the County seeks to litigate further in state court.
9	Rosemere's Motion to Lift the Stay [Dkt. #56] is GRANTED, and the stay is LIFTED.
10	Plaintiffs' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Dkt. #16] is RE-NOTED for March 22, 2013.
11	IT IS SO ORDERED.
12	DATED this 21st day of February, 2013
13	
14	Ronald B. Leighton
15	United States District Judge
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	