

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MICHAEL ANTHONY WEBB,

Plaintiff,

v.

L. CAHLANDER,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:13-cv-01154-DLB PC

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT’S
MOTION TO STAY DISCOVERY
PENDING RULING ON DISPOSITIVE
MOTION**

On December 15, 2014, the Court issued a discovery and scheduling order in this case. On March 11, 2015, Defendant L. Cahlander filed a motion for summary judgment based on exhaustion. Plaintiff filed an opposition on April 6, 2015, and Defendant filed a reply on April 13, 2015. The motion is currently pending before the Court.

Defendant L. Cahlander (Defendant) has moved for a stay of discovery pending the Court’s decision on Defendant’s pending Motion for Summary Judgment because the pending dispositive motion would resolve the entire case if granted and additional discovery is not required to decide the motion. A stay of discovery pending resolution of potentially dispositive issues furthers the goal of efficiency for the courts and the litigants. Little v. City of Seattle, 863 F.2d 681, 685 (9th Cir.1988) (stay of discovery pending resolution of immunity issue).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

The Court has considered all supporting and opposing arguments regarding Defendant’s motion to stay discovery pending a ruling on their dispositive motion. Good cause appearing, it is ordered that Defendant’s motion to stay discovery, including any discovery motions, pending the Court’s ruling on Defendant’s dispositive motion is GRANTED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 7, 2015

/s/ Dennis L. Beck
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE