



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

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

11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12 DATED: August 26, 2016

13   
14 \_\_\_\_\_  
15 NANCY J. KOPPE  
16 United States Magistrate Judge  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 <sup>2</sup> Conducting this preliminary peek puts the undersigned in an awkward position because the assigned  
28 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.*