



1 merits of the potentially dispositive motion and is convinced that the plaintiff will be unable to state a  
2 claim for relief. *See Kor Media Group, LLC v. Green*, 294 F.R.D. 579, 581 (D. Nev. 2013).<sup>1</sup>

3 The Court finds each of these elements exists here. First, the pending motion to dismiss  
4 challenges all claims brought by Plaintiff and is therefore potentially case-dispositive. Second, the  
5 motion to dismiss can be decided without discovery. Third, the Court is convinced that Plaintiff will  
6 be unable to state a claim pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) under either RICO or FISA.<sup>2</sup> Accordingly,  
7 the motion to stay discovery is hereby **GRANTED**.

8 In light of the order above that discovery be stayed, the Court further **GRANTS** the motion to  
9 quash subpoenas.

10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 DATED: May 2, 2014

12  
13   
14 NANCY J. KOPPE  
United States Magistrate Judge

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23 \_\_\_\_\_  
24 <sup>1</sup> Conducting this preliminary peek puts the undersigned in an awkward position because the assigned  
25 district judge who will decide the motion to dismiss may have a different view of its merits. *See Tradebay*,  
278 F.R.D. at 603. The undersigned's "preliminary peek" at the merits of that motion is not intended to  
26 prejudice its outcome. *See id.*

27 <sup>2</sup> The Court finds less persuasive Defendants' jurisdictional arguments, which focus on the lack of  
28 diversity jurisdiction in this case without acknowledging that Plaintiff purports to allege federal causes of  
action such that federal question jurisdiction may exist. *See* Docket No. 4-5. Nonetheless, the Court  
remains convinced that Plaintiff's claims will be dismissed for failing to state a claim.