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

LAWHQ, LLC and THOMAS ALVORD,	S
	S
Plaintiff,	S
	S
V.	S
	S
SEANA WILLING, in her official capacity as Chief	S
Disciplinary Counsel of the Texas Office of Chief	S
Disciplinary Counsel,	S
	S
Defendants.	Ś

1:20-CV-85-RP

#### <u>ORDER</u>

On March 19, 2020, the parties filed a Joint Motion to Hold the Proceedings in Abeyance, (Dkt. 16), accompanied by a joint Stipulation Regarding Motion to Hold the Proceedings in Abeyance, (Dkt. 15). They explain that Plaintiffs are challenging the constitutionality of Texas Disciplinary Rule of Professional Conduct 7.01(a), which states "[a] lawyer in private practice shall not practice under a trade name . . . or a firm name containing names other than those of one or more of the lawyers in the firm." (Dkt. 15 at 1). However, the Texas Office of Disciplinary Counsel, and by extension Defendant, "has initiated the disciplinary rule proposal process" which may result in an amendment of the rule at issue, removing the challenged provision. (*Id.* at 1–2). Therefore, the parties ask the Court to stay this case until the amendment process is complete. (Dkt. 16 at 1–2). Because that process's length is not definite, the stay they request is of indefinite length.

The Court has inherent power 'to control the disposition of the causes on its docket with economy of time and effort for itself, for counsel, and for litigants." *United States v. Colomb*, 419 F.3d 292, 299 (5th Cir. 2005) (quoting *Landis v. N. Am. Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936)). Here, the Court finds good cause to stay the case in the interest of fair and efficient dispute resolution.

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that the motion, (Dkt. 16), is GRANTED.

1

## Case 1:20-cv-00085-RP Document 17 Filed 03/20/20 Page 2 of 2

## IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this action is STAYED pending the completion of

the rule-proposal process as the parties describe it in their motion. (Id. at 1-2).

# **IT IS FINALLY ORDERED** that the parties shall file a report apprising the Court of the status of the rule-proposal process within **10 days** of its completion.

**SIGNED** on March 20, 2020.

Room

ROBERT PITMAN UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE