Trice v. Dam	ion et al	Do
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
10	GERALDINE A. TRICE,) Case No. 2:16-cv-01348-MMD-NJK
11	Plaintiff(s),	ORDER
12	VS.) (Docket No. 37)
13	JAMIE DAMION, et al.,))
14	Defendant(s).))
15	-	j)
16	Pending before the Court is a motion to stay filed by some Defendants. Docket No. 37. The	
17	motion seeks a stay pending resolution of various pending dispositive motions. See id. Plaintiff did	
18	not file a response to the motion to stay. The Court finds the matter properly resolved without oral	
19	argument. See Local Rule 78-1. For the reasons discussed below, the motion to stay is hereby	
20	GRANTED.	
21	The Court has broad discretionary power to control discovery. See, e.g., Little v. City of Seattle,	
22	863 F.2d 681, 685 (9th Cir. 1988). "The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure do not provide for automatic	
23	or blanket stays of discovery when a potentially dispositive motion is pending." <i>Tradebay, LLC v. eBay,</i>	
24	Inc., 278 F.R.D. 597, 601 (D. Nev. 2011). The party seeking a stay carries the heavy burden of making	
25	a strong showing why discovery should be denied. See	e, e.g., Turner Broadcasting Sys., Inc. v. Tracinda
26		
27	¹ The other appearing defendants have joined in some of those dispositive motions. <i>See</i> Docket 12.13.	
28	12, 19.	

Doc. 38

Corp., 175 F.R.D. 554, 556 (D. Nev. 1997). The case law in this District makes clear that requests to stay all discovery may be granted when: (1) the pending motion is potentially dispositive; (2) the potentially dispositive motion can be decided without additional discovery; and (3) the Court has taken a "preliminary peek" at the merits of the potentially dispositive motion and is convinced that the plaintiff will be unable to state a claim for relief. *See Kor Media Group, LLC v. Green*, 294 F.R.D. 579, 581 (D. Nev. 2013).²

Having reviewed the underlying motions to dismiss, the Court finds that these elements are met in this case and **GRANTS** the motion to stay discovery. If the motions to dismiss are not granted in full, the parties shall file a proposed discovery plan within seven days of the issuance of the order resolving the first motion to dismiss that is decided.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: August 26, 2016

NANCY J. KOPPE United States Magistrate Judge

² Conducting this preliminary peek puts the undersigned in an awkward position because the assigned district judge who will decide the motion to dismiss may have a different view of its merits. *See Tradebay*, 278 F.R.D. at 603. The undersigned's "preliminary peek" at the merits of that motion is not intended to prejudice its outcome. *See id*.