

1 J. Colby Williams, Esq.  
 Nevada Bar No. 5549  
 2 CAMPBELL & WILLIAMS  
 3 700 South Seventh Street  
 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101  
 4 Telephone: (702) 382-5222  
 jcw@cwlawlv.com

5  
 6 Attorneys for Defendants  
 ZUFFA, LLC and UFC Holdings, LLC

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

9 CAMERON PARK, individually, and on behalf  
 10 of all others similarly situated,

11 Plaintiffs,

12 v.

13 ZUFFA, LLC, UFC HOLDINGS, LLC,  
 14 NEULION, INC., and, DOES 1-100, inclusive,

15 Defendants.

Case No. 2:17-cv-02282-APG-VCF

**UNOPPOSED MOTION TO STAY  
 PROCEEDINGS PENDING A  
 TRANSFER DECISION BY THE  
 JUDICIAL PANEL ON  
 MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION**

*Action Requested by October 10, 2017*

16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28

1 Defendants Zuffa, LLC (“Zuffa”) and UFC Holdings, LLC (“UFC,” and, collectively,  
2 “Defendants”), through their attorneys of record, respectfully request that this Court, for good  
3 cause, stay all proceedings in this case pending a decision by the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict  
4 Litigation (“JPML”) on the motion, filed on October 3, 2017, under 28 U.S.C. § 1407, to  
5 centralize this and other similar lawsuits filed in federal district courts across the country (the  
6 “Actions”) for coordinated pretrial proceedings. Specifically, Defendants request the following  
7 Order:

- 8 1. Defendants’ time to answer, move or otherwise respond to Plaintiff’s Complaint is  
9 hereby extended pending a ruling by the JPML. If the JPML coordinates or  
10 consolidates the Actions in this Court, or if it denies centralization, the parties shall  
11 contact the Court promptly after receipt of that Order to discuss an appropriate  
12 schedule for filing a consolidated or amended complaint, if applicable, and a  
13 response date to the operative complaint.
- 14 2. By submission of this motion, Defendants are not waiving and expressly reserve  
15 any defense, including for failure to state a claim.

16 In the absence of a stay, Defendants are due to respond to the Complaint by **October 10,**  
17 **2017.** Counsel for Plaintiff do not oppose the requested stay.

## 18 MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

### 19 I. INTRODUCTION

20 This action is one of at least eight lawsuits (the “Actions”)<sup>1</sup> pending in multiple United  
21 States District Courts across the country alleging violations of state consumer protection laws,  
22 among other claims, in connection with the streaming broadcast of the boxing match between  
23 Floyd Mayweather and Conor McGregor on August 26, 2017. Zuffa, doing business as the

---

24 <sup>1</sup> The Actions include: *Bartel v. Showtime Networks, Inc.*, Case No. 3:17-cv-1331 (D. Or.); *Mallh*  
25 *v. Showtime Networks, Inc.*, Case No. 1:17-cv-06549 (S.D.N.Y.); *Garcia v. Showtime Networks,*  
26 *Inc., William Morris Endeavor Entertainment, LLC, Zuffa, LLC*, Case No. 3:17-cv-01803 (S.D.  
27 Cal.); *Ferrandini v. Zuffa, LLC, Showtime Networks, Inc.*, Case No. 2:17-cv-06781 (C.D. Cal.);  
28 *Vance v. Showtime Networks, Inc., Showtime Digital, Inc.*, Case No. 1:17-cv-6894 (S.D.N.Y.);  
*Park v. Zuffa, LLC, UFC Holdings LLC, NeuLion, Inc.*, Case No. 2:17-cv-02282 (D. Nev.); *Riley*  
*v. Zuffa, LLC, NeuLion, Inc.*, Case No. 2:17-cv-02308 (D. Nev.); *Daas v. NeuLion, Inc., Zuffa,*  
*LLC*, Case No. 1:17-cv-06944 (S.D.N.Y.).



1 Dist. LEXIS 110015, at \*10 (S.D. Tex. Oct. 14, 2010) (“The JPML’s guidance concerning the use  
2 of stay orders repeatedly stresses that ‘[a] stay of proceedings concerning questions common to all  
3 cases, such as class representation, may be appropriate to preserve the question for the transferee  
4 judge and avoid inconsistent rulings.’”). Indeed, case law is replete with decisions where district  
5 courts have stayed preliminary proceedings while awaiting decision from the JPML. *See, e.g.,*  
6 *Oregon, ex rel. Kroger v. Johnson & Johnson*, No. 11-CV-86-AC, 2011 WL 1347069, at \*7 (D.  
7 Or. Apr. 8, 2011) (granting stay pending transfer to the MDL when “the interest of judicial  
8 economy and consistency far outweigh any possible harm to Plaintiff resulting from a brief stay”);  
9 *Vermurlen v. Ameriquest Mortgage Co.*, No. 1:06-CV-828, 2007 WL 3104339, at \*1 (W.D. Mich.  
10 Oct. 22, 2007) (granting stay pending transfer to MDL “in the interest of judicial economy and  
11 efficiency”); *Buie v. Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Kansas City, Inc.*, No. 05-0534-CV-W-FJG,  
12 2005 WL 2218461, at \*1 (W.D. Mo. 2005) (granting stay pending transfer to MDL “in order to  
13 avoid duplicative proceedings” where “defendants will be forced to simultaneously litigate the  
14 same issues” and the “potential prejudice to plaintiffs is minimal, especially considering that  
15 plaintiffs’ counsel will be arguing substantially the same issues”).

16 “When considering a motion to stay proceedings pending a possible transfer to an MDL  
17 court, a district court may consider factors such as any potential prejudice to the non-moving  
18 party, hardship or inequity to the moving party if the proceedings are not stayed, and the interests  
19 of judicial economy and efficiency.” *Mangani v. Merck & Co.*, No. 2:06-CV-00914-KJD-PAL,  
20 2006 WL 2707459, at \*1 (D. Nev. Sept. 19, 2006) (*citing Rivers*, 980 F. Supp. at 1360). In this  
21 case, consideration of each of these factors supports granting a stay through the date the JPML  
22 rules on the pending motion to coordinate.

23 **1. Staying This Case Will Not Prejudice Any Party.**

24 No party will suffer any prejudice if the case is stayed at this time. No issues of venue,  
25 jurisdiction, or other pretrial motion issues have been raised. No discovery has occurred, and the  
26 parties have not yet begun meetings and exchanges pursuant to Rules 16(b) and 26(f) of the  
27 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. And Plaintiff does not oppose this motion. The motion sought  
28 is of reasonable duration and will expire upon the JPML’s decision on the pending motion.

1           **2. Defendants Will Be Significantly Prejudiced If The Case Is Not Stayed.**

2           Courts have widely recognized the prejudice that parties suffer if a complex individual  
3 case proceeds with pretrial activity and discovery pending a decision on an MDL transfer. *See,*  
4 *e.g., Hernandez v. ASNI, Inc.*, No. 2:15-CV-00078-LDG-NJK, 2015 WL 3932415, at \*1 (D. Nev.  
5 June 24, 2015) (“[c]ourts frequently grant stays pending a decision by the MDL Panel regarding  
6 whether to transfer a case,” and then granting such a stay because “the hardship and inequity to  
7 [the defendant] would be significant, as denying its request . . . would result in duplicative  
8 litigation in multiple courts.”); *see also Pate*, 2012 WL 3532780, at \*2 (“[a] stay pending an MDL  
9 transfer order will avoid duplicative discovery and pretrial management efforts.”).

10           This case is no different. Without a stay, Defendants will face substantial prejudice in that  
11 they will be obligated to answer, or otherwise respond to, the complaint; to proceed with a Rule  
12 26(f) conference; and to submit an initial report and proposed discovery plan under Rule 26(f).  
13 All of these matters could well occur before the MDL Motion is decided by the JPML, and all  
14 would be repeated before the MDL court if the case is transferred. Preliminary matters such as  
15 these are commonly handled by the MDL court and should be handled by that court in this case.

16           As stated previously, Zuffa also is a defendant in four of the other Actions. Plaintiffs in  
17 most of the other cases have consented to stays, which Zuffa is in the process of seeking from the  
18 other courts so it is not forced to engage in duplicative responses to the complaints and discovery,  
19 and to avoid risk of inconsistent orders or rulings in this case and the various other similar cases.  
20 This risk can be eliminated in part if this case is stayed pending ruling by the JPML.

21           **3. A Stay Of This Case Will Conserve Judicial Resources.**

22           A stay pending a potential MDL transfer is appropriate where it will conserve judicial  
23 resources and enhance efficiency. *See, e.g., Hernandez*, 2015 WL 3932415, at \*1 (granting  
24 motion to stay pending decision on MDL transfer as “resources would be saved by avoiding . . .  
25 duplicative litigation.”). If this case proceeds before the JPML’s ruling, duplicative pretrial  
26 proceedings likely would occur. The Court may have to consider and decide motions to dismiss  
27 and approve a case management plan. In addition, the Court may become involved in initial  
28 discovery disputes. Subsequently, if the case is transferred by the JPML, all of this Court’s effort

1 would be repeated and duplicated by the MDL court and this would “unnecessarily consume  
2 judicial time and energy.” *Rivers*, 980 F. Supp. at 1360. The Court should therefore stay the case,  
3 pending the decision on the MDL Motion, as other courts routinely do in similar circumstances.

4 **III. CONCLUSION**

5 The Court should exercise its inherent power to stay this case until forty-five (45) days  
6 after the JPML rules on the MDL Motion on terms requested above. A stay of this case will not  
7 prejudice any party, will protect all the parties from duplicative and burdensome efforts and  
8 potentially inconsistent rulings, and will promote judicial economy and efficiency in this  
9 litigation. In addition, granting this motion ensures that Defendants will have sufficient time to  
10 prepare and respond to the complaint in the unlikely even the MDL Motion is denied.

11  
12 DATED: October 4, 2017

CAMPBELL & WILLIAMS

13 /s/ J. Colby Williams

14 J. Colby Williams

15 Attorneys for Defendants ZUFFA, LLC and  
16 UFC HOLDINGS, LLC

17  
18 IT IS SO ORDERED:

19   
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

20 DATED: 10-13-2017  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

