UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

COMMISSIONERS:	Maureen K. Ohlhausen, Acting Chairman
	Terrell McSweeny

In the Matter of

Louisiana Real Estate Appraisers Board,) Respondent) Docket No. 9374

ORDER DENYING RESPONDENT'S RENEWED EXPEDITED MOTION TO STAY PART 3 ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS AND MOVE THE EVIDENTIARY HEARING DATE

On January 10, 2018, the Commission issued an order scheduling oral argument on two pending motions in this proceeding – a Motion to Dismiss Complaint, filed by Respondent Louisiana Real Estate Appraisers Board, and a Motion for Partial Summary Decision, submitted by Complaint Counsel ("the pending motions"). The Commission's order scheduled oral argument on February 22, 2018, and moved the deadlines for the Commission's rulings on the pending motions to April 9, 2018.

One day later, Respondent moved (1) to stay the administrative proceeding until the Commission renders its decisions on the pending motions and (2) to delay the start of the evidentiary hearing from May 30, 2018 to August 27, 2018. Respondent argued that granting its motion would avoid expenses of pretrial activity that might prove unnecessary, depending on how the Commission resolves the pending motions. On January 12, 2018, the Commission denied Respondent's motion. The Commission found that routine discovery costs of the type that Respondent sought to avoid generally do not outweigh the competing public interest in the efficient and expeditious resolution of litigated matters. The Commission also noted that, as previously requested by Respondent, the Commission had already stayed the proceeding and delayed commencement of the evidentiary hearing by four months.

On January 31, 2018, Respondent requested that the Commission reconsider its January 12 order; stay the administrative proceeding until after the Commission renders its decision on the pending motions; and move the starting date for the evidentiary hearing to September 10, 2018. Again, Respondent cites the cost of litigation. It elaborates regarding the burdens and distractions that litigation 5ti]Titseand urges that a stay ctuld permit the restlution of 5mportant issues i]Tiresented in this case regarding the state action doctrine in a manner least disruptive to its