

1 WENDY M. KRINCEK, ESQ., Bar # 06417
 Z. KATHRYN BRANSON, ESQ., Bar #11540
 2 LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C.
 3 3960 Howard Hughes Parkway
 Suite 300
 Las Vegas, NV 89169-5937
 4 Telephone: 702.862.8800
 Fax No.: 702.862.8811
 5 Email: wkrincek@littler.com
 Email: kbranson@littler.com

6 Attorneys for Defendant
 7 FITNESS ALLIANCE, LLC

8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 9 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

10 VICTOR BANUETT, an individual,
 11 Plaintiff,

Case No.: 2:16-cv-02732-APG-CWH

12 vs.

**STIPULATION AND PROPOSED ORDER
 TO STAY DISCOVERY**

13 FITNESS ALLIANCE, LLC, a Nevada
 Limited-Liability Company (dba Gold’s
 14 Gym); DOE Individuals 1-10 and ROE
 CORPORATIONS 1-10, inclusive,
 15 Defendants.

[FIRST REQUEST]

17 Plaintiff VICTOR BANUETT (“Plaintiff”) and Defendant FITNESS ALLIANCE, LLC
 18 (“Defendant”), by and through their respective counsel, do hereby stipulate and agree to stay
 19 discovery until the Court has ruled on Defendant’s Motion to Enforce Severance Agreement And
 20 Dismiss Case With Prejudice (“Defendant’s Motion to Enforce”) (**ECF No. 10**).

22 Courts have broad discretionary power to control discovery including the decision to allow or
 23 deny discovery. *See e.g., Little v. City of Seattle*, 863 F.2d 681, 685 (9th Cir. 1988). In evaluating
 24 the propriety of an order staying or limiting discovery while a dispositive motion is pending, the
 25 court considers the goal of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 1, which provides that the Rules should
 26 “be construed, administered, and employed by the court and the parties to secure the just, speedy,
 27 and inexpensive determination of every action.” With Rule 1 as its prime directive, the court must
 28

1 decide whether it is more just to speed the parties along in discovery while a dispositive motion is
2 pending or to delay discovery to accomplish the inexpensive determination of the case. *See Turner*
3 *Broadcasting System, Inc. v. Tracinda Corp.*, 175 F.R.D. 554, 556 (D. Nev. 1997); *see also Twin*
4 *City Fire Ins. v. Employers Insurance of Wausau*, 124 F.R.D. 652, 653 (D. Nev. 1989).

5
6 Further, in assessing a request to stay discovery, the court takes a “preliminary peek” at the
7 merits of the dispositive motion. *Tradebay, LLC, v. Ebay, Inc.*, 278 F.R.D. 597, 603 (D. Nev. 2011).
8 This “preliminary peek” does not prejudice the outcome of the motion; it merely evaluates whether
9 an order staying discovery is warranted. *Id.* Common examples of situations in which good cause
10 has been found to stay discovery are when jurisdiction, venue, or immunity are preliminary issues.
11 *Id.* Ultimately, the party seeking the stay “carries the heavy burden of making a strong showing why
12 discovery should be denied.” *Id.* (citing *Blankenship v. Hearst Corp.*, 519 F.2d 418, 429 (9th
13 Cir.1975)).
14

15 Defendant’s Motion to Enforce warrants a stay of discovery. First, the Motion is potentially
16 dispositive of the entire case as it seeks enforcement of the parties’ Confidential Severance
17 Agreement and General Release (“Severance Agreement”), wherein Plaintiff agreed to a release of
18 all claims relating to or arising from his employment with Defendant in exchange for a severance
19 payment. (**ECF No. 10, Exhibit B.**) Each of the claims alleged in his Complaint specifically arise
20 out of and relate to his employment with Defendant. This Court has inherent ability to summarily
21 enforce the Severance Agreement and dismiss Plaintiff’s Complaint with prejudice. *Dacanay v.*
22 *Mendoza*, 573 F.2d 1075, 1078 (9th Cir. 1978). Accordingly, the parties agree that Defendant’s
23 Motion to Enforce is the type warranting a stay of discovery.
24

25 Second, neither party will suffer hardship or inequity as a result of stay because further
26 discovery is unjustified at this point. Defendant has moved to enforce the Severance Agreement,
27 which, if granted, will result in dismissal with prejudice of the entire case. Also, the parties agree
28

1 that discovery is not necessary prior to the Court's determination as to whether or not the Severance
2 Agreement should be enforced and Plaintiff's claims dismissed with prejudice. Requiring the parties
3 to conduct discovery on claims that Plaintiff previously agreed not to bring before this Court would
4 result in an unnecessary expenditure of resources and is particularly prejudicial to Defendant.
5

6 Third, similar to the situation in *Little*, this is a case where a temporary stay of discovery will
7 further the goals of judicial economy, control of the Court's docket, and an inexpensive
8 determination of the case. 863 F.2d at 685. Ordering the parties to proceed with discovery could
9 potentially clog the Court's docket with discovery disputes on claims that may be dismissed, with
10 prejudice.

11 Accordingly, the parties have made the required showing to support their joint request to stay
12 discovery. For the reasons articulated above, the Court should stay discovery until an Order has

13 ///

14 ///

15 ///

1 been issued on Defendant's Motion to Enforce (ECF No. 10). If Plaintiff's claims survive, then the
2 parties will conduct a Rule 26(f) conference and submit a Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order at
3 such future date to be ordered by the Court.

4 Dated: January 9, 2017

Dated: January 10, 2017

6 Respectfully submitted,

Respectfully submitted,

8 /s/ Randal R. Leonard, Esq.
RANDAL R. LEONARD, ESQ.

/s/ Z. Kathryn Branson, Esq.
WENDY MEDURA KRINCEK, ESQ.
Z. KATHRYN BRANSON, ESQ.
LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C.

9 Attorney for Plaintiff
10 VICTOR BANUETT

11 Attorneys for Defendant
FITNESS ALLIANCE, LLC

12 IT IS SO ORDERED. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if Defendant's Motion to
13 Enforce Severance Agreement and Dismiss Case with Prejudice (ECF No. 10) is
14 denied, the parties must meet and confer and file a proposed stipulated discovery plan
and scheduling order within 21 days from the date of the order denying the motion.

15 
16 _____
HONORABLE CARL W. HOFFMAN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

17 January 11, 2017
18 Dated: _____