

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
STATESBORO DIVISION**

MARION STANLEY HAYES,

Plaintiff,

v.

COMMISSIONER HOMER BRYSON;  
MEDICAL DIRECTOR SHARON LEWIS;  
FACILITY DIRECTOR RICK JACOBS;  
FIELD OPERATIONS MANAGER ROBERT  
TOOLE; INMATE AFFAIR DIRECTOR  
LISA FOUNTAIN; WARDEN STANLEY  
WILLIAMS; DR. DEAN BROOME;  
HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATOR  
MR. SABINE; PHYSICIAN'S ASSISTANT  
MS. FARA; PHYSICIAN'S ASSISTANT  
STEPHEN NICOLOV; GEORGIA  
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS; and  
GEORGIA STATE PRISON,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NO.: 6:16-cv-20

**ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on Defendants' Motion to Stay Proceedings. (Doc. 18)

After careful consideration, Defendants' Motion is **GRANTED**.

Plaintiff has filed a complaint brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (Doc. 1) He is proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*. On August 11, 2016, Defendants filed a Motion to Dismiss. (Doc. 19.) Defendant has moved to stay discovery in this case until that Motion is resolved.

With regard to the timing of discovery, the Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit has recognized that

[i]f the district court dismisses a nonmeritorious claim before discovery has begun, unnecessary costs to the litigants and to the court system can be avoided. Conversely, delaying ruling on a motion to dismiss such a claim until after the parties complete discovery encourages abusive discovery and, if the court ultimately dismisses the claim, imposes unnecessary costs. For these reasons, any legally unsupported claim that would unduly enlarge the scope of discovery should be eliminated before the discovery stage, if possible.

Chudasama v. Mazda Motor Corp., 123 F.3d 1353, 1368 (11th Cir. 1997) (footnotes omitted).

For these reasons, this Court, and other courts within the Eleventh Circuit, routinely find good cause to stay the discovery period where there is a pending motion to dismiss. See, e.g., Habib v. Bank of Am. Corp., No. 1:10-cv-04079-SCJ-RGV, 2011 WL 2580971, at \*6 n.4 (N.D. Ga. Mar. 15, 2011) (citing Chudasama, 123 F.3d at 1368) (“[T]here is good cause to stay discovery obligations until the District Judge rules on [the defendant’s] motion to dismiss to avoid undue expense to both parties.”); Berry v. Canady, No. 2:09-cv-765-FtM-29SPC, 2011 WL 806230, at \*1 (M.D. Fla. Mar. 2, 2011) (quoting Moore v. Potter, 141 F. App’x 803, 807 (11th Cir. 2005)) (“[N]either the parties nor the court have any need for discovery before the court rules on the motion [to dismiss].”).

In the case at hand, the Court finds that good cause exists to stay this case until such time as a ruling is made on Defendants’ Motion and that no prejudice will accrue to the parties if Defendant’s request is granted. Specifically, a ruling on Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss before the commencement of discovery may save the parties time and resources by clarifying what issues the parties will need to address in discovery.

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that all proceedings, including discovery, are stayed pending a ruling by the Court on Defendants' Motion to Dismiss, at which time a discovery schedule will be entered as to any claims that may remain.

**SO ORDERED**, this 19th day of August, 2016.



---

R. STAN BAKER  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA