

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 2 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 3 SAN JOSE DIVISION

4 MORTGAGE ELECTRONIC
 5 REGISTRATION SYSTEMS, INC., et al.,

6 Plaintiffs,

7 v.

8 GARY MERLE KOEPPPEL, et al.,

9 Defendants.

Case No. [5:18-cv-03443-EJD](#)

**ORDER GRANTING EX PARTE
 MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER**

Re: Dkt. No. 85

10 Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc., Nationstar Mortgage LLC, U.S. Bank,
 11 N.A., and Wells Fargo, N.A. have moved, ex parte, for a protective order staying discovery
 12 pending the court's ruling on the pending Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings and Motion to
 13 Dismiss Third Party Complaint, which are set for hearing on October 17, 2019. The Koepfels
 14 opposed the ex parte motion.

15 "A district court has broad discretion to stay discovery pending the disposition of a
 16 dispositive motion." *Hall v. Tilton*, 2010 WL 539679, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 9, 2010) (citing
 17 *Panola Land Buyers Ass'n. v. Shuman*, 762 F.2d 1550, 1560 (11th Cir.1985)). Having considered
 18 the parties' papers, the court finds that the pending motions are case dispositive and that they may
 19 be resolved without further discovery. *See, e.g., Carter v. Oath Holdings, Inc.*, 2018 WL
 20 3067985, at *4 (N.D. Cal. June 21, 2018); *Pac. Lumber Co. v. Nat'l Union Fire Ins. Co. of*
 21 *Pittsburgh, PA*, 220 F.R.D. 349, 351-52 (N.D. Cal. 2003). Accordingly, the court stays discovery
 22 pending the court's ruling on the pending motions. If appropriate, the court will entertain a
 23 motion to extend discovery following its ruling on the pending motions.

24 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

25 Dated: October 7, 2019

26 

27 EDWARD J. DAVILA
 United States District Judge

28 Case No.: [5:18-cv-03443-EJD](#)
 ORDER GRANTING EX PARTE MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER