18

19

20

21

22

1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9	IN THE UNITI	ED STATE	S DISTRICT COURT
10	FOR THE NORTH	IERN DIST	TRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11	JOHN STEVEN HALLMAN,)	No. C 10-3548 LHK (PR)
12	Plaintiff,)	ORDER GRANTING
13)	DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO STAY DISCOVERY;
14	V.)	GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF
15	MATTHEW CATE, et al.,)	TIME; GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO
16	Defendants.)	AMEND COMPLAINT
17)	(Docket Nos. 27, 31 and 33)

Plaintiff, a state prisoner, filed this instant *pro se* prisoner complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On January 24, 2011, Defendants filed a motion to stay discovery based on qualified immunity. On February 7, 2011, Plaintiff filed a motion for extension of time to file his opposition to Defendants' motion to dismiss. On February 14, 2011, Plaintiff filed a motion for leave to file an amended complaint.

 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 the dispositive
 motion may not dispose of the entire case. Id. Here, should Defendants' motion to dismiss be
 granted, it would dispose of the entire case. Moreover, the Court should stay discovery until it
 resolves the question of qualified immunity. See Crawford-El v. Britton, 523 U.S. 574, 598
 Order Granting Defendants' Motion to Stay Discovery; Granting Plaintiff's Motion for Extension of Time; Granting Plaintiff's Motion to Amend Complaint P:/PRO-SE\SJLHK\CR.10\Hallman548GrantStay-Eot.wpd (1998). Accordingly, the Court GRANTS Defendants' motion to stay discovery until disposition
 of Defendants' motion to dismiss.

Because it appears no party would be prejudiced by an extension, Plaintiff's motion for
extension of time to file his opposition is GRANTED. Plaintiff shall file his opposition, on or
before March 25, 2011. Defendants shall file their reply brief no later than fifteen (15) days
from the date the opposition is filed.

A review of Plaintiff's proposed amended complaint reveals that it adds more details and clarifies Plaintiff's claims, but does not alter the Defendants named or the substance of Plaintiff's allegations. Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion for leave to file an amended complaint is GRANTED. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(1)(B).

The clerk shall file Plaintiff's amended complaint. Plaintiff's amended complaint is the operative complaint. *See* London v. Cooper & Lybrand, 644 F.2d 811, 814 (9th Cir, 1981).

This order terminates docket nos. 27, 31 and 33.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: <u>3/14/11</u>

H. Koh

United States District Judge