IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF OREGON

Jeanyne James; Robin Colbert; Jane Drevo; Sam Drevo; Brooke Edge and Bill Edge, Sr.; Lori Fowler; Iris Hampton; James Holland; Rachelle McMcaster; Kristina Montoya; Northwest River Guides, LLC; Shariene Stockton and Kevin Stockton, Victor Palfreyman; Palfreyman Family Trust; Duane Brunn, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated; Alfred Cuozzo; Deborah Jo Fawcett; David Giller, Sr.; Richard Jensen; Scott Johnson; Frank King, individually and in his capacity as trustee of the King Revocable Trust; Stephen David Nielsen; Cory Staniforth; and Deborah Tank,
Plaintiffs-Respondents
Cross-Appellants,

and

Mary Kathleen Becherer et al.,
Plaintiffs,

and

Oregon Department of Justice,
Creditor-Respondent,

v.

Pacificorp, an Oregon Corporation, and Pacific Power an Oregon registered electric utility and assumed business name of Pacificorp,
Defendants-Appellants
Cross-Respondents.

Multnomah County Circuit Court
20CV33885

A183140

ORDER

Appellants have petitioned the Supreme Court for review of this court's order denying appellants' motion for a stay of ongoing trial court proceedings pending resolution of this appeal. Appellants' petition for review means that under ORAP 9.30(2)(d), this court must decide whether to exercise its discretion "to proceed with the case or await disposition by the Supreme Court." Because any decision by the Supreme Court regarding this court's order on appellants' stay request does not seem likely to be relevant to this court's ultimate decision on the merits of the appeal, the court exercises its discretion under ORAP 9.30(2)(d) to proceed with the case while the petition for review is pending.

ORDER

Because ORAP 9.30(2)(d) makes it a discretionary call for this court whether to proceed with an appeal upon the filing of a petition for review of a non-dispositive order, the court recognizes that the effect of appellants' filing of the petition for review on the briefing schedule may be unclear to the parties. For that reason, the court on its own motion extends the deadline for the filing of the cross-reply brief by 14 days, until December 19, 2025. No further extensions will be allowed.

Appellants have also filed a motion with this court requesting expedited consideration of this appeal, including expedited calendaring for oral argument. Because the court's oral argument calendar for January 2026 has already been set, the court will set the appeal for argument and submission during the first week of February 2026; the date and time will be forthcoming.

Erin C. Lagesen
Chief Judge
11/26/2025

c: Brad Daniels
Yoona Park
Per A Ramfjord
Reilley Keating
Daniel Mensher
Keith A Ketterling
Denise Fjordbeck
Timothy S DeJong
Cody Berne
Emily Johnson
Erin Roycroft
Nicholas A Kahl
Matthew Preusch
Sarah R Osborn
Derek C Johnson
Marilyn A Heiken
Alexander Glenn Tievsky
Blaine Evanson
Matthew Kalmanson
John Pruitt
Meghana Shah

ORDER

Sara Kobak
Ivan Resendiz Gutierrez
Jeremy C Rice
Paul Stewart
Irion Sanger
John Greene
J Aaron Landau
Jeremy Marwell
Lydia Anderson Dana
Carsen Nies
Elizabeth Savage
Matthew S Kirkpatrick
Benjamin Gould

ORDER