

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 ROBINHOOD DERIVATIVES, LLC,

Case No.: 2:25-cv-01541-APG-DJA

4 Plaintiff

Order Denying Motion for Stay Pending Appeal

5 v.

[ECF No. 92]

6 MIKE DREITZER, et al.,

7 Defendants

8 Plaintiff Robinhood Derivatives, LLC moves for a stay of my order denying its motion
9 for an injunction pending the Ninth Circuit’s resolution of Robinhood’s appeal of that order.

10 Alternatively, Robinhood requests a short-term stay to give it time to seek a stay from the Ninth
11 Circuit. The defendants and intervenor oppose.

12 Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 62(d), I may “grant an injunction on terms for
13 bond or other terms that secure the opposing party’s rights” while “an appeal is pending from an
14 interlocutory order . . . that . . . dissolves” a preliminary injunction. To determine whether to
15 grant a motion to stay pending appeal, I consider “(1) whether the stay applicant has made a
16 strong showing that he is likely to succeed on the merits; (2) whether the applicant will be
17 irreparably injured absent a stay; (3) whether issuance of the stay will substantially injure the
18 other parties interested in the proceeding; and (4) where the public interest lies.” *Nken v. Holder*,
19 556 U.S. 418, 434 (2009). I deny the motion for stay for the reasons articulated in my order
20 denying Robinhood’s motion for an injunction. ECF No. 90; *see also Nken*, 556 U.S. at 434
21 (stating there “is substantial overlap between these and the factors governing preliminary
22 injunctions”).

23 ////

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

I THEREFORE ORDER that plaintiff Robinhood Derivatives, LLC’s motion to stay case
(ECF No.92) is DENIED.

DATED this 16th day of December, 2025.



ANDREW P. GORDON
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE