

1 Shannon G. Splaine, Esq.
 2 Nevada Bar No. 8241
 3 LINCOLN, GUSTAFSON & CERCOS LLP
 4 3960 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite
 5 200
 6 Las Vegas, NV 89169-5968
 7 Tel: (702) 257-1997
 8 Fax: (702) 257-2203
 9 E-Mail: ssplaine@lgclawoffice.com

Bryan C. Shartle – Pro Hac Vice
 Bradley J. St. Angelo – Pro Hac Vice
 SESSIONS ISRAEL & SHARTLE, LLC
 3850 N. Causeway Blvd., Suite 200
 Metairie, LA 70002-7227
 Tel: (504) 828-3700
 Fax: (504) 828-3737
 E-mail: bshartle@sessions.legal
 E-mail: bstangelo@sessions.legal

8 James K. Schultz, Esq.
 9 Nevada Bar No. 10219
 10 SESSIONS ISRAEL & SHARTLE, L.L.P.
 11 1550 Hotel Circle North, Suite 260
 12 San Diego, CA 92108
 13 Tel: (619) 758-1891
 14 Fax: (877) 334-0661
 15 E-mail jschultz@sessions.legal

16 *Attorneys for Defendant Transworld Systems Inc.*

17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 18 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

19 Richard Klein, <i>et al.</i> ,) Case No. 2:22-cv-01392 GMN BNW
)
20 Plaintiffs,) STIPULATION AND ORDER FOR
) STAY OF DISCOVERY PENDING
21 vs.) RULINGS ON DEFENDANTS’
) MOTIONS TO DISMISS
22 National Collegiate Student Loan Trust)
23 2005-3, <i>et al.</i> ,) (First Request)
)
24 Defendants.)
)
25)
26)
27)
28)

1 **STIPULATION**

2 It is hereby stipulated by Plaintiffs, Richard Klein, Raymond Urias and
3 Sandra J. Gunter (“Plaintiffs”), and Defendants, Transworld Systems Inc. (“TSI”),
4 National Collegiate Student Loan Trust (“NCSLT”) 2005-3, NCSLT 2006-3,
5 NCSLT 2007-1, NCSLT 2007-2, and NCSLT 2007-3, and NCSLT 2007-4 (the
6 “Trust Defendants”), and Pennsylvania High Education Assistance Agency
7 (“PHEAA”) (collectively, “Defendants” and, with Plaintiffs, the “Parties”), through
8 undersigned counsel, that discovery in this action be stayed pending resolution of
9 Defendants’ respective motions to dismiss Plaintiffs’ First Amended Complaint
10 (the “Motions to Dismiss”) (ECF Nos. 39, 40, 42). In support of this Stipulated
11 Motion, the Parties respectfully state as follows:

12 **I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

13 On August 26, 2022, Plaintiffs filed a Complaint against the Trust
14 Defendants. ECF No. 1.

15 On December 23, 2022, Plaintiffs filed a First Amended Complaint (the
16 “FAC), adding TSI and PHEAA as additional defendants. ECF No. 20.

17 On March 8, 2023, TSI and the Trust Defendants filed Motions to Dismiss
18 the FAC. ECF Nos. 39, 40.

19 On March 13, 2023, PHEAA filed a Motion to Dismiss the FAC. ECF No.
20 42.

21 On April 10, 2023, Plaintiffs filed their Opposition to PHEAA’s Motion to
22 Dismiss. ECF No. 52.

23 PHEAA’s Reply in Support of its Motion to Dismiss is currently due on April
24 17.

25 Plaintiffs’ Oppositions to TSI and the Trust Defendants’ Motions to Dismiss
26 are currently due on April 19, 2023. *See* ECF No. 51.

II. LAW AND ARGUMENT

As the Ninth Circuit has confirmed, “[t]he purpose of F.R.Civ.P. 12(b)(6) is to enable defendants to challenge the legal sufficiency of complaints without subjecting themselves to discovery.” *Rutman Wine Co. v. E. & J. Gallo Winery*, 829 F.2d 729, 738 (9th Cir. 1987). Likewise, a district court has “wide discretion in controlling discovery.” *Little v. Seattle*, 863 F.2d 681, 685 (9th Cir. 1988); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(d)(1) (describing the court’s ability to limit the scope of discovery). Ultimately, when deciding whether to grant a stay of discovery, a court is guided by the objectives of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 1 that ensures a “just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of every action.” *Schrader v. Wynn Las Vegas, LLC*, 2021 WL 4810324, *3 (D. Nev. Oct. 14, 2021) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 1); *see also Tradebay, LLC v. eBay, Inc.*, 278 F.R.D. 597, 601 (D. Nev. 2011) (explaining that courts evaluating the propriety of a stay have cautioned against the use of resources that may be rendered unnecessary, noting the simple, but accurate principle: “Discovery is expensive”).

All Defendants have Motions to Dismiss pending before the Court seeking dismissal of all of Plaintiffs’ respective claims against each of them. *See* ECF Nos. 39, 40, 42. Plaintiffs have already filed an opposition to one of the Motions to Dismiss (ECF No. 52) and will soon file their oppositions to the two remaining motions. The Parties are in agreement that discovery is not required for the Court to decide the Motions to Dismiss. Because the Court’s ruling(s) on the Motions to Dismiss could potentially result in dismissal of the entire case (or some Defendants), it would be an inefficient use of resources to engage in discovery prior to the Court’s ruling. *See Sibley v. U.S. Sup. Ct.*, 786 F. Supp. 2d 338, 346 (D.D.C. 2011) (“[I]t is well settled that discovery is generally considered inappropriate while a motion that would be thoroughly dispositive of the claims in the Complaint is pending.”).

III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Parties respectfully request the Court stay all discovery until the Court issues a decision on Defendants' Motions to Dismiss the FAC.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

Dated: April 18, 2023

FREEDOM LAW FIRM

WRIGHT, FINLAY & ZAK, LLP

/s/ George Haines

/s/ Ramir M. Hernandez

George Haines, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 9411
Gerardo Avalos, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 15171
8985 South Eastern Ave., Suite 350
Las Vegas, Nevada 89123

Ramir M. Hernandez, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 13146
Darren T. Brenner
Nevada Bar No. 8386
7785 W. Sahara Avenue, Suite 200
Las Vegas, Nevada 89117
(702) 475-7964; Fax: (702) 946-1345

MILBERG COLEMAN BRYSON
PHILLIPS GROSSMAN, PLLC

LOCKE LORD LLP

Scott C. Harris*
N.C. Bar No: 35328
900 W. Morgan Street
Raleigh, NC 27603
Telephone: (919) 600-5003
Facsimile: (919) 600-5035
sharris@milberg.com

/s/ J. Matthew Goodin
J. Matthew Goodin
111 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 4100
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 443-0472
jmgoodin@lockelord.com

Gary M. Klinger*
227 W. Monroe Street, Suite 2100
Chicago, IL 60606
Phone: 866.252.0878
gklinger@milberg.com

Attorneys for the Trust Defendants

*to motion for appearance *pro hac vice*

SESSIONS, ISRAEL & SHARTLE,
LLP

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the
Proposed Class Attorneys for Plaintiff
and on behalf of all others similarly
situated*

/s/ James K. Schultz
James K. Schultz
Nevada Bar No. 10219
1550 Hotel Circle North, Suite 260
San Diego, CA 92108
Tel: (619) 758-1891

1 Fax: (877) 334-0661
2 E-mail: jschultz@sessions.legal

3 SESSIONS, ISRAEL & SHARTLE,
4 LLC

5 /s/ Bradley J. St. Angelo
6 Bryan C. Shartle – *Pro Hac Vice*
7 Bradley J. St. Angelo – *Pro Hac Vice*
8 3850 N. Causeway Blvd., Suite 200
9 Metairie, LA 70002-7227
10 Tel: (504) 828-3700
11 Fax: (504) 828-3737
12 E-mail: bshartle@sessions.legal
13 E-mail: bstangelo@sessions.legal

14 LINCOLN, GUSTAFSON &
15 CERCOS LLP

16 Shannon G. Splaine, Esq.
17 Nevada Bar No. 8241
18 3960 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite
19 200
20 Las Vegas, NV 89169-5968
21 Tel: (702) 257-1997
22 Fax: (702) 257-2203
23 E-Mail: ssplaine@lgclawoffice.com

24 *Attorneys for Transworld Systems Inc.*

25 BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER
26 SCHRECK, LLP

27 /s/ Patrick J. Reilly
28 Patrick J. Reilly, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 6103
Monique S. Jammer, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 15420
100 North City Parkway, Suite 1600
Las Vegas, Nevada 89106

1 Telephone: 702.382.2101
2 Facsimile: 702.382.8135
3 preilly@bhfs.com
4 mjammer@bhfs.com


5 *Attorneys for American Education*
6 *Services, LLC*

7 **ORDER**

8 Pursuant to the Parties' stipulation, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

9 Discovery in this matter is STAYED in its entirety pending a ruling on
10 Defendants' Motions to Dismiss (ECF Nos. 39, 40, 42). In the event the Court
11 allows one or more claims to proceed, any remaining parties shall submit a proposed
12 discovery plan and scheduling order no later than **14** days after the Court
13 issues its ruling.

14 IT IS SO ORDERED:

15
16
17 

18 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

19
20 DATED: April 20, 2023