Smith v. Vail et al Doc. 22

2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 10 AT TACOMA 11 KEVIN JOSEPH SMITH 12 CASE NO. C10-5614 RJB/JRC Plaintiff, 13 ORDER GRANTING A STAY OF **DISCOVERY** v. 14 ELDON VAIL, 15 Defendant. 16 17 This 42 U.S.C. § 1983 civil rights action has been referred to United States Magistrate 18 Judge J. Richard Creatura pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A) and (B), and Local Magistrate 19 Judge's Rules MJR 1, MJR3 and MJR4. 20 Defendant Eldon Vail, through counsel, asks the Court to stay discovery (ECF No. 11) 21 while his Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 10) is pending. The Motion to Dismiss is based on an 22 23 adequate post-deprivation remedy; failure to allege personal participation; and, statute of 24 limitations. The motion to stay discovery is GRANTED. 25 Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2)(C), 26 the court must limit the frequency or extent of discovery otherwise allowed by these rules or by local rule if it determines that: . . . (iii) the burden or

expense of the proposed discovery outweighs its likely benefit, considering the needs of the case, the amount in controversy, the parties' resources, the importance of the issues at stake in the action, and the importance of the discovery in resolving the issues.

"Trial courts have broad discretion and inherent power to stay discovery until preliminary questions that may dispose of the case are determined". Hahn v. Star Bank, 190 F.3d 708, 719 (6th Cir. 1999). In this case, plaintiff already has responded to the Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 12); therefore, plaintiff does not have any need to gather information in order to respond to the Motion. Therefore, discovery shall be stayed until the Court's resolution of Defendant's Motion to Dismiss.

The Clerk's Office is directed to send plaintiff a copy of this Order.

DATED this 12th day of November, 2010.

J. Richard Creatura

United States Magistrate Judge