Rushton v. Shulkin Doc. 16

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

## **AUGUSTA DIVISION**

	ORDER	
Dorondant.		
Defendant.	)	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	
v.	)	CV 117-171
Plaintiff,	)	
71 1 100	)	
SABRINA RUSHTON,	)	

Defendant moves to stay discovery pending resolution of its motion to dismiss. (Doc. no. 14.) For the reasons set forth below, the Court **GRANTS** the request for a stay.

The "[C]ourt has broad inherent power to stay discovery until preliminary issues can be settled which may be dispositive of some important aspect of the case." <u>Feldman v. Flood</u>, 176 F.R.D. 651, 652 (M.D. Fla. 1997). Before deciding to stay discovery, the Court should:

balance the harm produced by a delay in discovery against the possibility that the motion will be granted and entirely eliminate the need for such discovery. This involves weighing the likely costs and burdens of proceeding with discovery. It may be helpful to take a preliminary peek at the merits of the allegedly dispositive motion to see if on its face there appears to be an immediate and clear possibility that it will be granted.

<u>Id.</u> (internal citation and quotation omitted).

Based on a preliminary peek at the defense motion, the Court finds an immediate and clear possibility of a ruling "which may be dispositive of some important aspect of the case." Indeed, Defendant has moved for dismissal of the case in its entirety, (see doc. no. 10), and

Plaintiff does not object to the stay (doc. no. 15). When balancing the costs and burdens to the parties, the Court concludes discovery should be stayed pending resolution of the motion to dismiss. See Chudasama v. Mazda Motor Corp., 123 F.3d 1353, 1367 (11th Cir. 1997); Moore v. Potter, 141 F. App'x 803, 807-08 (11th Cir. 2005).

Thus, the Court **STAYS** all discovery in this action pending resolution of Defendant's motion to dismiss. Should any portion of the case remain after resolution of the motion, the parties shall confer and submit a Rule 26(f) Report, with proposed case deadlines, within seven days of the Court's final ruling.

SO ORDERED this 19th day of March, 2018, at Augusta, Georgia.

BRIAN K. EPPS

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA