

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

| | | |
|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| BROOKE CARDOZA, et al., |) | |
| |) | Case No. 2:13-cv-1820-JAD-NJK |
| Plaintiff(s), |) | |
| |) | ORDER |
| vs. |) | |
| |) | (Docket No. 90) |
| BLOOMIN' BRANDS, INC., et al., |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendant(s). |) | |

Pending before the Court is the parties' disputed discovery plan. Docket No. 90. The Court held a hearing on the parties' conflicting positions. See Docket No. 97. The Court has also received supplemental briefing from the parties. Docket Nos. 98-100. Having reviewed the arguments and in light of the procedural posture of this particular case, the Court finds that the goals outlined in Rule 1 for the "just, speedy, and inexpensive" resolution of this case are best served by ordering discovery to begin *after* resolution of the motion to dismiss and the motion for conditional certification. Accordingly, the Court ORDERS the parties to submit a proposed discovery plan within 14 days of the resolution of the motion for conditional certification. In the interim, the Court agrees with Plaintiffs that discovery should not be conducted with the limited exception that the parties shall exchange initial disclosures as already ordered.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: April 18, 2014



NANCY J. KOPPE
United States Magistrate Judge