

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**

ROBERT MORRIS,	)	
	)	Case No. 2:14-cv-01998-GMN-CWH
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	<b><u>ORDER</u></b>
	)	
AMERICAN RELIABLE INS. CO., d/b/a	)	
Assurant, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

---


This matter is before the Court on the parties’ Stipulation and Proposed Order to Stay Discovery (doc. # 24), filed March 19, 2015. The parties seek to stay discovery pending disposition of the motion to dismiss in the instant case.

A court has broad discretionary power to control its docket, which extends to the issuance of a stay. See e.g., Landis v. North American Co., 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936). This power to stay is “incidental to the power inherent in every court to control the disposition of the causes of action on its docket with economy of time and effort for itself, for counsel, and for litigants.” Id. In exercising its discretion, the court must consider factors such as, “wise judicial administration, giving regard to conservation of judicial resources and comprehensive disposition of litigation.” Colorado River Water Conserv. Dist. v. United States, 424 U.S. 800, 817 (1976). An overly lenient standard for granting a motion to stay would result in unnecessary delay in many cases. Moreover, a court should not grant a stay absent a showing of hardship if “there is even a fair possibility that the stay . . . will work damage to someone else.” Dependable Highway Express, Inc. v. Navigators Insurance Co., 498 F.3d 1059, 1066 (9th Cir. 2007). Therefore, a court must balance the competing interests affected by a stay such as, the “hardship or inequity which a party may suffer in being required to go forward.” Lockyer v. State of California, 398 F.3d 1098, 1110 (9th Cir. 2005).

1 Here, the Court finds that a stay is not warranted. The parties have failed to file any points and  
2 authority in support of their request for a stay as required by Local Rule 7-2. The Court also finds that  
3 a stay is not warranted, as it would delay the efficient resolution of this case and unnecessarily disrupt  
4 the Court's schedule. Accordingly, the Court finds that a stay of discovery is not warranted at this  
5 time.

6 Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that parties' Stipulation and Proposed Order to Stay  
7 Discovery (doc. # 24) is **denied without prejudice**.

8 DATED: March 20, 2015

9  
10  
11   
12 \_\_\_\_\_  
13 **C.W. Hoffman, Jr.**  
14 **United States Magistrate Judge**  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28