

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**

COMPUTERIZED SCREENING, INC.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	Case No. 2:14-cv-00573-RFB-NJK
)	
vs.)	ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
)	STAY
HEALTHSPOT, INC.,)	
)	(Docket No. 27)
Defendant.)	

Pending before the Court is Defendant’s motion to stay this proceeding pending the resolution of a “parallel action by identical parties in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Ohio.” Docket No. 27. In deciding whether to grant a stay, the Court is guided by the objectives of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 1 to ensure a “just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of every action.” *Tradebay, LLC v. eBay, Inc.*, 278 F.R.D. 597, 601 (D. Nev. 2011). The Court finds that a stay would be contrary to the goals of Rule 1. Moreover, the matter in the Northern District of Ohio has concluded. *HealthSpot, Inc. v. Computerized Screening, Inc.*, 2015 WL 5172977, at *3 (N.D. Ohio Sept. 3, 2015). Accordingly, Defendant’s motion to stay is hereby **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.
DATED: September 11, 2015



NANCY J. KOPPE
United States Magistrate Judge