

factors as: “(1) whether the litigation is at an early stage ...; (2) whether a stay will unduly prejudice or tactically disadvantage the non-moving party; (3) whether a stay will simplify the issues in question and streamline the trial; and (4) whether a stay will reduce the burden of litigation on the parties and on the court.” *Grice Engineering, Inc. v. JG Innovations, Inc.*, 691 F. Supp.2d 915, 920 (W.D. Wis. 2010).

Based on the specific facts identified in the Joint Motion to Stay, the Court agrees that entry of a temporary stay to allow the parties to focus their resources on settlement negotiations is proper and appropriate. If those negotiations are successful, then the interests of efficiency, judicial economy and conservation of litigant resources will have been well served by entry of this temporary stay. If they are not successful within a reasonably confined period of time, then this action can be promptly restored to a litigation track with minimal inconvenience and disruption to the parties and the Court alike. Moreover, because both parties have requested such relief, there is no concern that entry of a stay will unfairly prejudice or disadvantage any party.

In light of the foregoing, the Court finds that there are considerable benefits to entry of a temporary stay at this time to enable the parties to focus on attempting to reach a reasonable compromise or, at a minimum, narrowing the claims and issues joined for trial. Under the circumstances of this case, a brief stay will accomplish these benefits with a negligible risk of undue delay, prejudice or harm to any party. Because entry of the requested stay will serve the interests of justice, the Court exercises its discretion by **granting** the Joint Motion to Stay (doc. 28). This action, and all associated discovery, pretrial and trial deadlines, are hereby **stayed** through and including **August 25, 2014**, at which time the stay will expire and this action will be referred to Magistrate Judge Bivins for entry of an amended Rule 16(b) Scheduling Order. Should a settlement be reached in the interim, the parties should notify the Court promptly.

DONE and ORDERED this 24th day of June, 2014.

s/ WILLIAM H. STEELE

CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE