## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NORTH DAKOTA NORTHWESTERN DIVISION

Plaintiff,  vs.  Dirk Kempthorne, Secretary, United States Department of the Interior, or his Predecessor-in-office; Bureau of Indian Affairs, Louis Dauphinais as Middle School Principal, and in his individual capacity,  Defendants.  ORDER  ORDER  Case No. 4:08-cv-077	Bernadette Baker,	)	
Dirk Kempthorne, Secretary, United States ) Department of the Interior, or his ) Predecessor-in-office; Bureau of Indian ) Affairs, Louis Dauphinais as Middle School ) Principal, and in his individual capacity, ) Case No. 4:08-cv-077	Plaintiff,	)	ORDER
Department of the Interior, or his  Predecessor-in-office; Bureau of Indian  Affairs, Louis Dauphinais as Middle School )  Principal, and in his individual capacity,  Case No. 4:08-cv-077	vs.	)	
Predecessor-in-office; Bureau of Indian ) Affairs, Louis Dauphinais as Middle School ) Principal, and in his individual capacity, ) Case No. 4:08-cv-077	Dirk Kempthorne, Secretary, United States	)	
Affairs, Louis Dauphinais as Middle School ) Principal, and in his individual capacity, ) Case No. 4:08-cv-077	Department of the Interior, or his	)	
Principal, and in his individual capacity, ) Case No. 4:08-cv-077	*	)	
) Case No. 4:08-cv-077	Affairs, Louis Dauphinais as Middle School	)	
,	Principal, and in his individual capacity,	)	
Defendants.		)	Case No. 4:08-cv-077
	Defendants.	)	

On March 5, 2010, the Government filed a Motion to Stay Discovery. It seeks to suspend discovery pending the court's ruling on its Motion for Summary Judgment, which it filed in September 17, 2009. It maintains that further discovery would not assist Plaintiff in responding to its motion and that further discovery would be wasteful and burdensome.

On March 11, 2010, Plaintiff filed a response in opposition to the Government's Motion to Stay Discovery. Therein she complains, inter alia, that the Government has failed to strictly adhere to deadlines set forth in the court's scheduling order and otherwise failed to respond to her interrogatories.

The issues presented in the Government's Motion for Summary Judgment are essentially limited to Plaintiff's administrative record. Although Plaintiff has complained that the Government is dragging its feet on discovery, its alleged inaction does not appear to have hindered or otherwise

impeded her ability to respond to Government's motion.<sup>1</sup> The court concludes that the

Government's request for a stay was made in good faith and therefore **GRANTS** its motion (Docket

No. 54). Discovery shall be stayed pending disposition of the Motion for Summary Judgment. If

during the court's consideration of the Motion for Summary Judgment Plaintiff is able to

demonstrate that there are relevant matters outside the administrative record that the court can

consider as a matter of law and that further discovery needs to be done with respect to these matters,

the court can delay ruling on the motion and permit the discovery.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 12th day of March, 2010.

/s/ Charles S. Miller, Jr.

Charles S. Miller, Jr.

United States Magistrate Judge

<sup>1</sup>On September 24, 2009, Baker filed a response to the Government's Motion for Summary Judgment to which she attached forty-four exhibits. (Docket No. 48).

2