



Aaron B. Clark (15404)
Trinity Jordan (15875)
Jordan E. Westgate (16098)
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
222 South Main Street, Suite 1830
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101
Telephone: (801) 401-1600
aclark@atllp.com
tjordan@atllp.com
jwestgate@atllp.com

*Attorneys for Defendants Jason Hall, Natalie Hall,
and Woodcraft Mill & Cabinet, Inc.*

**IN THE THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
IN AND FOR SALT LAKE COUNTY, STATE OF UTAH**

JEFFREY D. GASTON, Plaintiff, v. JASON HALL, an individual; NATALIE HALL, an individual; GEORGE SCHLIESSER, an individual; WOODCRAFT MILL & CABINET, INC., a Utah corporation; and BLUFFDALE CITY, a municipality of the State of Utah, Defendants.	ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO STAY CASE PENDING RESOLUTION OF RELATED CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS Case No: 230905528 Judge Chelsea Koch
--	---

This matter came before the Court on the Motion to Stay Case Pending Resolution of Related Criminal Proceedings (the “**Motion**”), filed on February 7, 2024 by Jason Hall, Natalie Hall, and Woodcraft Mill & Cabinet, Inc. (collectively the “**Hall Defendants**”). Plaintiff Jeffrey D. Gaston (“**Plaintiff**”) opposed the Motion, filing a Memorandum in Opposition to Defendants’

Motion to Stay Case on February 22, 2024. The Court heard oral arguments via Webex on May 13, 2024.

The Court GRANTS the Motion to Stay, and in doing so, has made the following findings:

1. While criminal matters are often delayed for years, in this case, the trial is set just six weeks from now.
2. The facts of the criminal case and this case overlap with one another; they are essentially the same case.
3. Additionally, Plaintiff has not yet served one of the Defendants, so the timeline of the case is not going to be particularly delayed.
4. The Court notes the legitimate concern with Mr. Hall having to participate in discovery and answer while facing a criminal information, particularly where the alleged conduct overlaps significantly with the facts of this case.
5. The Court also finds Mr. Hall's argument persuasive, as it relates to the prejudice prong, that Plaintiff could have filed this lawsuit earlier based on the fact that the underlying events took place years ago but waited until now to file.
6. Based on these considerations, the Court hereby GRANTS the stay for 90 days (or until August 11, 2024). If the trial gets continued again and is not going to be tried within that 90-day period, however, the stay will expire and require the Defendants to answer the Complaint within 21 days of the expiration of that stay.
7. Plaintiff is permitted to continue effecting service on Defendants during the stay period. Plaintiff must include in any summons the relevant information

related to this stay.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

*****EXECUTED AND ENTERED BY THE COURT AS INDICATED BY THE DATE
AND SEAL AT THE TOP OF THE FIRST PAGE*****

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

YOUNG HOFFMAN, LLC

/s/ Scott L. Sackett II

Scott L. Sackett II

Attorneys for Plaintiff

*Electronic Signature affixed with permission
via email 5/15/2024.*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 15th day of May, 2024, I caused a copy of the foregoing to be served on all counsel of record via the Court's Electronic Filing System.

/s/ Shelby Irvin