1

2

3

4   UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

5   DISTRICT OF NEVADA

6   * * *

7   STEVEN R. DAVIS,   Case No. 2:18-cv-00673-JCM-PAL

8   Plaintiff,   ORDER
            v.
9   (Mot Stay – ECF No. 42)
     UNITEL VOICE, LLC, et al.,   (Mot Stay – ECF No. 48)
10
                            Defendants.
11

12   Before the court is defendant Unitel Voice, LLC's Motion to Stay Discovery (ECF No. 42).

13   The court has reviewed the motion, and defendants CenturyLink, Inc.'s and Somos, Inc.'s Non-

14   Oppositions (ECF Nos. 46, 47). Rather than filing a response to the motion, plaintiff filed his own

15   Motion to Stay or Modify the Court Order Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order (ECF No. 48).

16   The court has also reviewed this motion and defendant Unitel Voice, LLC's Response

17   (ECF No. 53).

18   Defendants' motion requests that this court stay discovery pending ruling on the pending

19   motions to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction (ECF Nos. 10, 26, 43). Defendants argue that

20   because the motions to dismiss are potentially case-dispositive, and discovery is expected to be

21   voluminous any discovery and discovery disputes would become moot as to any defendant

22   dismissed from this matter.

23   Plaintiff's motion also requests that discovery be stayed until decision of the pending

24   motions to dismiss. Alternatively, if the court is not inclined to stay discovery, plaintiff requests

25   a 6-month extension of the current discovery plan and scheduling order deadlines.

26   Having reviewed and considered the matter,

27   **IT IS ORDERED** that:

28   1. The Motions to Stay Discovery (ECF No. 42, 48) are **GRANTED**.

1

2. If one or both of the motions to dismiss are denied, the parties shall have 14 days from the date of the last order denying the motion to dismiss to submit a proposed amended discovery plan and scheduling order.

DATED this 21st day of December 2018.

PEGGY A. LEEN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE