

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 KAHEAL PARRISH, ) No. C 11-1438 LHK (PR)  
11 )  
12 Plaintiff, ) ORDER GRANTING MOTION  
13 v. ) TO STAY DISCOVERY;  
14 A. SOLIS, et al., ) DENYING MOTIONS TO  
15 Defendants. ) COMPEL  
(Docket Nos. 61, 68, 70)

16 Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding *pro se*, filed a civil rights complaint pursuant to 42  
17 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging that prison officials violated his right to be free from excessive force. On  
18 December 5, 2011, Defendant filed a motion for summary judgment. On March 29, 2012,  
19 Defendants filed a motion to stay discovery pending the disposition of their argument that they  
20 are entitled to qualified immunity. On April 9, 2012, the Court denied Plaintiff's request to stay  
21 Defendants' motion for summary judgment so that he may have additional time to conduct  
22 discovery. On April 20, 2012, Plaintiff filed two motions to compel discovery.

23 As a general rule, a district court should stay discovery until the issue of qualified  
24 immunity is resolved. *See Crawford-El v. Britton*, 523 U.S. 574, 598 (1998); *Harlow v.*  
25 *Fitzgerald*, 457 U.S. 800, 818 (1982). Accordingly, Defendants' motion to stay discovery until  
26 the Court has ruled on the issue of qualified immunity, as raised in Defendants' motion for  
27 summary judgment, is hereby GRANTED. (Docket No. 61.) In light of this ruling, Plaintiff's  
28 motions to compel are hereby DENIED. (Docket Nos. 68, 70.)

1 IT IS SO ORDERED.  
2 DATED: 5/10/12  
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

  
LUCY H. KOH  
United States District Judge