


Oct. 18, 2007). “Factors favoring issuance of a stay include the potential for the dispositive motion to terminate all the claims in the case or all the claims against particular defendants, strong support for the dispositive motion on the merits, and irrelevancy of the discovery at issue to the dispositive motion.” *Yongo*, 2008 WL 516744, at *2 (quoting *Tilley*, 270 F. Supp. 2d at 735).

Here, Defendants have demonstrated good cause for their request to stay discovery and other deadlines pending resolution of Defendants’ motion to dismiss. A review of this case indicates that, during the pendency of the instant motion, the parties have already completed portions of the discovery requirements for which Defendants are seeking a stay. The parties held a telephone conference on or about November 11, 2013, regarding the making of a discovery plan and Defendants submitted a Rule 26(f) report to the court on December 3, 2013. [DE-31]. The docket indicates that Plaintiff has likewise submitted a Rule 26 report to the court, but review of the filing indicates that Plaintiff has merely submitted a document stating his position on the making of a discovery plan and does not reflect a proposed discovery plan. [DE-29]. Accordingly, all discovery obligations are STAYED pending the court’s ruling on Defendants’ motion to dismiss. To the extent Defendants’ motion [DE-19] is not dispositive of all claims, the parties shall submit a revised discovery plan and exchange mandatory initial disclosures within twenty-one (21) days of the court’s ruling on the motion.

So ordered, the 11th day of December, 2013.



Robert B. Jones, Jr.
United States Magistrate Judge