

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 14-cv-00391-MEH

CURTIS GUION,

Plaintiff,

v.

SPURLOCK, Correctional Officer, in his official and individual capacities,
GILBERT, Correctional Officer, in his official and individual capacities,
CUTCHER, Sergeant, in his official and individual capacities,
GROOMS, Correctional Officer, in his official and individual capacities,
Z. MAHER, Correctional Officer, in his official and individual capacities,
CASADY, Correctional Officer, in his official and individual capacities,
WHITE, Correctional Officer, in his official and individual capacities,
TRUJILLO, Correctional Officer, in his official and individual capacities,
BARBERO, Captain, in his official and individual capacities,
TRAVIS TRANI, Warden, in his official and individual capacities,
BROWN, Correctional Officer, in his official and individual capacities,
P. ARCHULETA, Correctional Officer, in his official and individual capacities,
MONTOYA, Correctional Officer, in his official and individual capacities,
MORRIS, in his official and individual capacities,
BENSKO, Correctional Officer, in his official and individual capacities,
D. RAYMOND, Sergeant, in his official and individual capacities,
S. FOSTER, Associate Warden, in his official and individual capacities,
SOLANO, Correctional Officer, in his official and individual capacities,
J.R. ADAMS, Correctional Officer, in his official and individual capacities,
BUTERO, Sergeant, in his official and individual capacities, and
MAHONEY, Correctional Officer, in his official and individual capacities,

Defendants.

MINUTE ORDER

Entered by Michael E. Hegarty, United States Magistrate Judge, on September 3, 2014.

The Motion to Stay Discovery [filed August 29, 2014; docket #48] filed by Defendants Spurlock, Gilbert, Maher, White, Barbero, Trani, Brown, Archuleta, Montoya, Morris, Raymond, Foster, Solano, Adams, Butero, and Mahoney is **denied without prejudice** for the following reasons.

First, whether the qualified immunity defense applies to all of the claims is unclear. Some

of the Defendants have not yet appeared in this case and, though titled a “Partial Motion to Dismiss,” the motion appears to request dismissal of all of the remaining claims on the basis of qualified immunity. Thus, in the interest of judicial efficiency, the Court will seek clarity on these matters at the September 8, 2014 Scheduling Conference.