26

27

28

¹ The response fails to include citation to any legal authority, and can be construed as consent to the granting of the motion on that basis. *See* Local Rule 7-2(d). At any rate, the response fails to include any meaningfully developed argument articulating a basis on which the Court should deny the pending motion to stay discovery. *Cf. Kor Media Group, LLC v. Green*, 294 FR.D. 579, 582 n.3 (D. Nev. 2013) (courts do not address arguments that are not meaningfully developed).

Court can determine whether a proposed second amended complaint filed after exhaustion of administrative remedies provides a jurisdictional basis for the case to proceed against the Federal Defendants.² The Court will not enter an indefinite stay of discovery, however, and will instead stay discovery for a period of four months without prejudice to the filing of a request to extend the stay.

Accordingly, the motion to stay discovery is **GRANTED** as follows. Discovery shall be stayed until February 8, 2018. In the event Plaintiffs exhaust their administrative remedies and the Court resolves their motion for leave to file a second amended complaint before February 8, 2018, an amended discovery plan shall be filed within 14 days of the issuance of that order. Otherwise, either a request to extend the stay of discovery or an amended discovery plan shall be filed by February 8, 2018.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: October 11, 2017

NANCY J. KOPPE

United States Magistrate Judge

² The Court herein expresses no opinion on that anticipated motion.