

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

RONALD COLLINS,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOSHUA COLLINS, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:16-cv-00111-MMD-WGC

ORDER

The parties entered into a global settlement of three cases currently before the Court (Case Nos. 3:17-cv-417-MMD-WGC, 3:16-cv-111-MMD-WGC and 3:18-cv-329-MMD-CLB). (ECF No. 264.) Since the parties reached settlement, Plaintiff Ronald Collins has filed multiple motions in this matter (ECF Nos. 265, 267, 268), including for a hearing regarding the parties' settlement.¹ The Court will *sua sponte* stay this case.

A district court has discretionary power to stay proceedings in its own court. *Landis v. N. Am. Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 254–55 (1936). In deciding whether to grant a stay, the court should consider “the possible damage which may result from the granting of a stay, the hardship or inequity which a party may suffer in being required to go forward, and the orderly course of justice measured in terms of the simplifying or complicating of issues, proof, and questions of law which could be expected to result from a stay.” *Lockyer v. Mirant Corp.*, 398 F.3d 1098, 1110 (9th Cir. 2005) (quoting *Landis*, 299 U.S. at 268). The court should also consider the judicial resources that may be saved by staying the action. See, e.g., *Pate v. DePuy Orthopaedics, Inc.*, No. 2:12-cv-01168-MMD-CWH, 2012 WL 3532780, at *2 (D. Nev. Aug. 14, 2012).

///

///

¹Defendants also moved for an extension of time to respond in opposition to Plaintiff's motion for a hearing (ECF No. 271), which has been granted (ECF No. 272).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

The Court finds that significant resources will be saved by ordering a stay. Further, there would be no prejudice, damage, hardship, or inequity to the parties by the Court staying this action.

It is therefore ordered that this case is stayed *sua sponte* pending a determination relating to the global settlement.

It is further ordered that ECF Nos. 255, 261, and 265 are denied without prejudice to Plaintiff refiling once the stay is lifted. Briefing will proceed as to ECF No. 267 only because that motion directly concerns the parties' settlement and briefing will aid the Court in resolving the ongoing disputes.

DATED THIS 5th day of December 2019.



MIRANDA M. DU
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE