




1 “carries the heavy burden of making a ‘strong showing’ why discovery should be denied.” *Turner*  
2 *Broad. Sys., Inc.*, 175 F.R.D. at 556.

3 Here, the parties do not meet their burden of explaining why a stay of discovery is  
4 appropriate in this case. They do not explain why they are requesting a stay. Nor do they explain  
5 whether the pending motions to dismiss are potentially dispositive of the entire case or whether the  
6 pending motions can be decided without additional discovery. *See Ministerio Roca Solida v. U.S.*  
7 *Dep’t of Fish & Wildlife*, 288 F.R.D. 500, 506 (D. Nev. 2013). The court therefore is unable to  
8 evaluate whether a stay of discovery is appropriate in this case.

9 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the parties’ Stipulation and Order to Stay Discovery  
10 (ECF No. 16) is DENIED without prejudice.

11  
12 DATED: December 2, 2015

13  
14   
15 \_\_\_\_\_  
16 **C.W. Hoffman, Jr.**  
17 **United States Magistrate Judge**