

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

‘O’

| | | | |
|-----------------|---|-------------|----------------|
| Case No. | 2:14-cv-07621-CAS(FFMx) | Date | April 17, 2015 |
| Title | DAISY VASQUEZ, ET AL. v. TWC ADMINISTRATION LLC, ET AL. | | |

Present: The Honorable CHRISTINA A. SNYDER

Catherine Jeang

Not Present

N/A

Deputy Clerk

Court Reporter / Recorder

Tape No.

Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:

Attorneys Present for Defendants:

Not Present

Not Present

Proceedings: (In Chambers) DEFENDANTS’ MOTION TO BIFURCATE AND STAY CLASS DISCOVERY (Dkt. No. 28, filed March 30, 2015)

The Court finds this motion appropriate for decision without oral argument. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 78; C.D. Cal. Local Rule 7-15. Accordingly, the hearing date of April 27, 2015, is vacated, and the matter is hereby taken under submission.

The Court is in receipt of defendants’ motion to bifurcate pretrial proceedings into individual liability and class phases, and stay class discovery pending the Court’s decision on summary judgment. Dkt. No. 28. Plaintiffs opposed the motion on April 6, 2015, and defendants filed a reply on April 13, 2015. Dkt. Nos. 35, 44. Subsequent to the filing of the motion to bifurcate and stay, defendants filed a motion for summary judgment, which is set for hearing on May 4, 2015. Dkt. No. 36. Additionally, the Court recently approved a stipulation enlarging the deadline for plaintiffs to file a motion for class certification to June 8, 2015. Dkt. No. 47.

Having considered the parties’ arguments, the Court **DENIES** the instant motion, declining to bifurcate any proceedings at this time or to stay class discovery and related motion practice.

The Court also denies plaintiffs’ request, raised in opposition to the instant motion, to hold defendants’ pending motion for summary judgment in abeyance until the Court hears plaintiffs’ yet-to-be-filed motion for class certification. See Wright v. Schock, 742 F.2d 541, 544 (9th Cir. 1984) (“Where the defendant assumes the risk that summary judgment in his favor will have only stare decisis effect on the members of the putative class, it is within the discretion of the district court to rule on the summary judgment

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

‘O’

Case No. 2:14-cv-07621-CAS(FFMx) Date April 17, 2015

Title DAISY VASQUEZ, ET AL. v. TWC ADMINISTRATION LLC, ET AL.

motion first.”). Finally, the Court also rejects as premature plaintiffs’ request that the Court issue an order ruling that defendants are “waiving the protections of one-way intervention” by filing a motion for summary judgment before plaintiffs’ motion for class certification.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Initials of Preparer

00 : 00

CMJ