

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

JERRY SALAS  
  
v.  
  
MICHAEL KOEHN et al.,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
Defendants.

3:16-CV-00635-RCJ-CBC

**ORDER**

Before this Court is the Plaintiff’s Objections to Minute Order (ECF No. 40). In the motion, the Plaintiff objects to an interlocutory minute order of Magistrate Judge Carla B. Carry (ECF No. 36), which denied the Plaintiff’s Motion for Medical Records (ECF No. 32).

The case is currently stayed pending the screening of Plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint (ECF No. 30). It is currently unclear, which claims, if any, will survive the screening process. In the ECF No. 36 Order, Judge Carry held it was not necessary to depart from the prion’s policy at this juncture by allowing the Plaintiff to have his medical records in his possession. Nev. Dep’t. of Corrections Admin. Reg. 639.

The Supreme Court has held that the lower courts are given broad discretion to stay cases as a matter of their inherent authority. *Landis v. North American Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1939). The Plaintiff files the instant motion in contravention to the Court ordered stay of the case pending the screening. As a part of the Court’s broad discretion and inherent authority, the Court declines to address the merits of the instant motion, until the screening process is completed, and the stay is lifted. At such time, the Court may consider the merits of Plaintiff’s contentions.


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

**CONCLUSION**

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Plaintiff’s Objections to Minute Order (ECF No. 40) is DENIED without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: This 18<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2019.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
ROBERT C. JONES  
United States District Judge