

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**

KRYSTAL CAMPELL, et al.,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff(s),	)	Case No. 2:15-cv-00452-GMN-NJK
	)	
vs.	)	
	)	ORDER
DEAN MARTIN DR – LAS VEGAS, LLC, et al.,	)	(Docket No. 22)
	)	
Defendant(s).	)	

Pending before the Court is the parties’ stipulated discovery plan (Docket No. 22), which is hereby **DENIED** without prejudice. Within the proposed discovery plan, the parties state that they should have “180 days [for discovery], measured from the date on which the Court issues its Order regarding subject matter jurisdiction.” Docket No. 22, at 2. The parties represent that they have not begun discovery because the Court has not resolved the subject matter jurisdiction issue that was raised in a March 13, 2015, order to show cause. *Id.*, at 1. The parties are essentially requesting a stay of discovery, pending the resolution of the Court’s decision regarding subject matter jurisdiction.

...  
...  
...  
...  
...

1           The Court has considered the request in light of the goals of Rule 1 to “secure the just,  
2 speedy, and inexpensive” determination of all cases. For good cause shown, discovery is **STAYED**  
3 pending resolution of the Court’s decision regarding subject matter jurisdiction. In the event that  
4 the Court’s decision regarding subject matter jurisdiction does not result in the case being remanded  
5 to state court, the parties shall file a joint discovery plan within seven days of the issuance of the  
6 order regarding subject matter jurisdiction.

7           IT IS SO ORDERED.

8           DATED: July 20, 2015

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
NANCY J. KOPPE  
United States Magistrate Judge