

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 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ROBERT HUGH COLE,)	No. C 10-1476 LHK (PR)
)	
Plaintiff,)	ORDER GRANTING
)	DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS
v.)	FOR EXTENSION OF TIME
)	TO FILE DISPOSITIVE
MATHEW CATE, et al.,)	MOTION; ORDER GRANTING
)	MOTION TO STAY
Defendants.)	DISCOVERY

(Docket Nos. 25, 31 & 34)

Plaintiff, a state prisoner, filed this instant *pro se* prisoner complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Before the Court are Defendants' motions for an extension of time to file their dispositive motion.

On October 22, 2010 and November 22, 2010, Defendants filed motions for an extension of time to file their dispositive motion. On November 30, 2010, Defendants filed a motion for summary judgment. Defendants' motions for extension of time are GRANTED, and Defendants' motion for summary judgment shall be deemed timely filed.

Defendants also filed a motion to stay discovery pending a ruling on their motion for summary judgment. A district court has broad discretion to stay discovery pending the disposition of a dispositive motion. *See Panola Land Buyers Ass'n v. Shuman*, 762 F.2d 1550, 1560 (11th Cir. 1985). However, motions to stay discovery are not favored where resolution of

1 the dispositive motion may not dispose of the entire case. *Id.* Here, should Defendants' motion
2 for summary judgment be granted, it would dispose of the entire case. Moreover, the Court
3 should stay discovery until it resolves the question of qualified immunity. *See Crawford-El v.*
4 *Britton*, 523 U.S. 574, 598 (1998). Accordingly, the Court GRANTS Defendants' motion to stay
5 discovery until disposition of Defendants' motion for summary judgment.

6 This order terminates docket numbers 25, 31 and 34.

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 DATED: 12/17/2010

9 
10 LUCY H. KOH
11 United States District Judge