## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

LAS VEGAS DEVELOPMENT GROUP, LLC,

Plaintiff(s),

ORDER

V.

2014-3 IH EQUITY OWNER, LP, et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:15-cv-00917-GMN-NJK

(Docket No. 45)

Pending before the Court is Defendant Bank of America's motion to stay discovery pending resolution of its motion to dismiss. Docket No. 45; *see also* Docket Nos. 47, 52 (joinders).<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff filed a response, which does not contest the relief sought. *See* Docket No. 54 ("Plaintiff does not oppose the entry of a stay"). Moreover, the Court agrees that a stay of discovery is appropriate in this case pending resolution of Defendant's motion to dismiss. *See, e.g., Kor Media Group, LLC v. Green*, 294 F.R.D. 579, 581 (D. Nev. 2013) (outlining standards). Accordingly, Defendant's motion to stay discovery is hereby **GRANTED**. In the event resolution of the motion to dismiss does not result in the termination of this case, the parties shall file a joint proposed discovery plan within 14 days of the issuance of the order resolving that motion. The parties' recently filed discovery plan (Docket No. 61) is **DENIED** without prejudice.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The motion is mislabeled as a motion to partially lift the stay in this matter. The stay was already lifted. *See* Docket No. 44. The motion actually seeks a stay of discovery pending resolution of the motion to dismiss. *Id.* at 3-4.

In its response, Plaintiff seeks to stay the entire case (including of the resolution of the motion to dismiss). *See* Docket No. 54 at 7-9. A responsive brief is not a vehicle to seek relief. If Plaintiff seeks an order staying the entire case, it must file a proper motion seeking such relief. *See* Local Rule 7-2(a). The Court does not opine herein as to the merits of such a request.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: April 3, 2018

NANCY J. KOPPE

United States Magistrate Judge