

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHRISTOPHER LIPSEY, Jr.,
Plaintiff,
v.
REDDY, *et al.*,
Defendants.

Case No. 2:17-cv-01434-KJM-JDP (PC)
ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS’
MOTION TO STAY CONSIDERATION OF
ALL PENDING MOTIONS
ECF No. 95

Defendants have filed a motion that asks the court to stay consideration of all pending motions and grant an extension to file a reply to plaintiff’s opposition to their second motion to compel. ECF No. 95. Defendants explain that plaintiff has entered into settlement negotiations in *Coleman v. Newsom*, 2:90-cv-00520-KJM-DB (E.D. Cal.)—where plaintiff is an intervener—and that those negotiations are likely to resolve the claims in this case. *Id.* at 2. Defendants’ motion will be granted, as modified below.

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that:

1. Defendants’ motion, ECF No. 95, is granted.
2. This action is stayed pending further court order.
3. Defendants shall file a status report every thirty days advising the court of the status of plaintiff’s settlement negotiations in *Coleman v. Newsom*, 2:90-cv-00520-KJM-DB (E.D. Cal.).
4. The deadline for defendants’ to file a reply to plaintiff’s opposition to their second

1 motion to compel, ECF No. 93, is vacated. If settlement discussions do not resolve the claims in
2 this action, the court will set a new date for defendants to file their reply.

3
4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 Dated: May 5, 2022


6 JEREMY D. PETERSON
7 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28