Martinez v. Baker et al	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	DISTRICT OF NEVADA
10 11 12	ROBERT C. MARTINEZ,  Plaintiff(s),  ORDER  vs.  (Parket No. 2:16-cv-01546-JAD-NJK
13 14 15	RENEE BAKER, et al.,  Defendant(s).  (Docket No. 34)
16	Pending before the Court is a stipulation that certain Defendants do not need to respond to
17	any discovery until 30 days after a ruling on a pending motion to dismiss. Docket No. 34. Although
18	no so labeled, the request effectively seeks a stay of discovery with respect to these Defendants. The
19	filing of a dispositive motion, standing alone, is not sufficient grounds to stay discovery. See, e.g.,
20	Tradebay, LLC v. eBay, Inc., 278 F.R.D. 597, 601 (D. Nev. 2011). Instead, such a request must
21	address several additional considerations to show that a stay of discovery is proper. See, e.g., Kor
22	Media Group, LLC v. Green, 294 F.R.D. 579, 581 (D. Nev. 2013) (outlining analysis). The pending
23	stipulation states only that the outcome of the motion to dismiss may eliminate the need for
24 25	discovery, without addressing the relevant standards. Accordingly, it is <b>DENIED</b> without prejudice. IT IS SO ORDERED.
26	DATED: December 7, 2016
27 28	NANCY J. KOPPE United States Magistrate Judge

Doc. 35