

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
CHARLOTTE DIVISION
CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:14-CV-607-GCM-DCK**

CATLIN SPECIALTY INSURANCE COMPANY,)
)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.)
)
 JAFRUM INTERNATIONAL, INC.,)
 HELMET VENTURE, INC., and)
 TEGOL, INC.,)
)
 Defendants.)
)
)
 JAFRUM INTERNATIONAL, INC.,)
)
 Third-Party Plaintiff,)
)
 v.)
)
 SENTINEL INSURANCE COMPANY)
 and CHARLOTTE INSURANCE &)
 FINANCIAL GROUP, LLC,)
)
 Third-Party Defendants.)
)

ORDER

THIS MATTER IS BEFORE THE COURT on the parties’ “Joint Motion For Extension Of Temporary Stay Of Proceedings” (Document No. 44) filed February 16, 2016. This motion has been referred to the undersigned Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), and immediate review is appropriate. Having carefully considered the motion and the record, the undersigned will deny the motion.

As an initial matter, the undersigned notes that the parties filed a “Joint Rule 26(f) Report” (Document No. 30) on April 9, 2015. The parties reported that their dispute here is primarily legal in nature and likely to be resolved by motions for judgment on the pleadings or for summary

judgment. (Document No. 30, p.1). On September 14, 2015, the undersigned ordered that the parties may file their dispositive motions on or before October 16, 2015. (Document No. 37, p.7).

On October 7, 2015, the parties filed their first “Joint Motion For Temporary Stay Of Proceedings” (Document No. 40). The undersigned observes that the pending motion is the parties’ third request to stay these proceedings. See (Document Nos. 40, 42, and 44). In each of the previous motions, the parties declared that a sixty (60) day stay would be sufficient. (Document Nos. 40 and 42). Now the parties seek an indefinite extension of the “temporary stay” until sometime after the conclusion of related actions in this Court and in the United States District Court for the Central District of California. (Document No. 44, pp.2-4).

Finally, the undersigned observes that when the Court granted the parties’ previous request to continue the stay of these proceedings, the parties were advised that “[f]urther requests to extend time to stay these proceedings are unlikely to be allowed.” (Document No. 43, p.1).

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that the “Joint Motion For Extension Of Temporary Stay Of Proceedings” (Document No. 44) is **DENIED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the parties shall have up to and including **March 18, 2016** to file dispositive motions.

SO ORDERED.

Signed: February 17, 2016



David C. Keesler
United States Magistrate Judge

