Cueto v. Thomas et al Doc. 20

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

AMIEL CUETO,

Plaintiff,

v.

ROBERT THOMAS, LLOYD KARMEIER, RITA GARMAN, THOMAS FITZGERALD, ANNE BURKE, CHARLES FREEMAN, THOMAS KILBRIDE, and JAMES GROGAN,

Defendants.

No. 08-0868-DRH

**ORDER** 

HERNDON, Chief Judge:

Pending before the Court is Defendants' January 23, 2009 joint motion to stay discovery (Doc. 17). As of this date, Plaintiff has not responded to the motion. Based on the reasons stated in the motion, the Court **GRANTS** the motion. The Court **STAYS** discovery in this matter pending disposition of the pending motions to dismiss.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed this 17th day of February, 2009.

/s/ David&Herndon

Chief Judge United States District Court

<sup>1</sup>Local Rule 7.1(g) provides in part: "A party opposing such motion shall have **ten** (10) **days** after service of the motion to file a written response. Failure to file a timely response to a motion may, in the Court's discretion, be considered an admission of the merits of the motion."