

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  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION**

JANE DOE 1, ET AL.,  
Plaintiffs,  
v.  
KIRSTJEN NIELSEN, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. [18-cv-02349-BLF](#)


**ORDER DENYING OPPOSED  
MOTION TO STAY REMAINING  
MOTION TO DISMISS DEADLINES**

[Re: ECF 117]

In the present motion, Defendants request that the Court stay the deadline for them to reply to Plaintiffs’ opposition to Defendants’ motion to dismiss and to reset the hearing on Defendants’ motion to dismiss until “at least two weeks after the jurisdictional discovery period closes.” *See* ECF 117. This motion is DENIED. Because Defendants recognize that the results of jurisdictional discovery are “intricately linked and fundamental to resolution of the claims Defendants raised in their dismissal motion,” Mot. at 2, the appropriate course of action is for Defendants to withdraw their pending motion to dismiss and refile it after the conclusion of the jurisdictional discovery period and to stipulate with Plaintiffs that a motion to dismiss at that time would be timely filed under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: October 17, 2018

  
BETH LABSON FREEMAN  
United States District Judge