

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

**Hernandez and Varon v. Event Tickets Center, Inc. and
TicketNetwork, Inc.**

Hernandez and Varon · No. No. 2:24-cv-1983 DAD AC · Decided October 30, 2025

SUMMARY

The court grants defendants’ motion to stay discovery pending resolution of their motions to compel arbitration. The court concludes that the arbitration motions are potentially dispositive, can be decided without further discovery, and that the balance of case-management factors supports a stay.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Allison Claire
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	October 30, 2025
DOCKET	No. 2:24-cv-1983 DAD AC
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendants moved to stay discovery pending the district judge's resolution of their fully briefed motions to compel arbitration.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied a discretionary case-management standard, considering whether the pending motions to compel arbitration were potentially dispositive or would render the requested discovery unnecessary, whether the motions could be decided without additional discovery, and the potential prejudice and efficiency consequences of a stay.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court order with no reporter citation.
PARTIES	Kristina Hernandez, Julie Varon v. Event Tickets Center, Inc., TicketNetwork, Inc.

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- arbitration
- civil procedure
- class actions
- consumer protection

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

arbitration

consumer protection

contracts

class actions

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether discovery should be stayed pending resolution of defendants' motions to compel arbitration.
2. Whether the pending arbitration motions were potentially dispositive of the action.
3. Whether the arbitration motions could be decided without additional discovery.

HOLDINGS

1. A stay of discovery is warranted where the pending motions to compel arbitration are potentially dispositive and can be resolved without additional discovery, and the balance of efficiency and prejudice considerations supports a stay.
2. The defendants' motions to compel arbitration were sufficiently potentially dispositive to support a stay of discovery.
3. The second prong of the discovery-stay test was satisfied because the fully briefed arbitration motions could be resolved without further discovery.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Courts in the Ninth Circuit rely heavily on two factors to determine if delaying discovery is appropriate: (1) whether the pending motion is potentially dispositive of the case, or at least would render unnecessary the discovery at issue; and (2) whether the pending motion can be decided absent additional discovery.” (1)

“The undersigned will stay discovery pending Judge Drozd’s resolution of the motions to compel arbitration.” (2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiffs allege that Event Tickets Center and TicketNetwork used drip-pricing practices on a ticket-resale website by displaying only part of the total price until the final checkout screen. Plaintiffs allege that they paid substantially more than the initially advertised ticket prices and assert California consumer-protection, false-advertising, unfair-competition, and quasi-contract claims on behalf of a proposed class. The defendants' website allegedly included a hyperlink to terms and policies containing an arbitration clause.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs commenced the action on July 19, 2024, later filed an amended complaint, and filed the operative Second Amended Complaint on June 5, 2025. Defendants separately moved to compel arbitration of all claims, and after those motions were submitted for decision, jointly moved to stay discovery. The magistrate judge granted the motion to stay discovery pending Judge Drozd's resolution of the arbitration motions.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Little v. City of Seattle, 863 F.2d 681, 685 (9th Cir. 1988)
- Clinton v. Jones, 520 U.S. 681, 706 (1997)
- Lockyer v. Mirant Corp., 398 F.3d 1098, 1109 (9th Cir. 2005)
- Salazar v. Honest Tea, Inc., No. 2:13-cv-02318 KJM EFB, 2015 WL 6537813, at *1, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 146357, at *4 (E.D. Cal. 2015)
- Mlejnecky v. Olympus Imaging Am., Inc., Case No. 2:10-cv-02630 JAM KJN, 2011 WL 489743, at *9, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16128, at *28, *32 (E.D. Cal. Feb. 7, 2011)
- Yamasaki v. Zicam LLC, No. 21-cv-0259 HSG, 2021 WL 3675214, at *1, 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 157156, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 19, 2021)
- Skellerup Industries Limited v. City of Los Angeles, 163 F.R.D. 598, 601 (C.D. Cal. 1995)
- Williams v. Experian, Case No. CV-23-01076-PHX-DWL, 2024 WL 73396767, at *3, 2024 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 31078, at *9–10 (D. Ariz. Feb. 23, 2024)
- Stavrianoudakis v. U.S. Department of Fish & Wildlife, No. 1:18-CV-01505 LJO BAM, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 219337, 2019 WL 9667685, at *3 (E.D. Cal. Dec. 20, 2019)
- Trucmai Huynh v. Allstate Northbrook Indemnity Co., No. 1:24-cv-0157 KES EPG, 2024 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 93414, at *6, 2024 WL 2883228 (E.D. Cal. 2024)
- Kramer v. Toyota Motor Corp., 705 F.3d 1122, 1128 (9th Cir. 2013)
- Zamudio v. Aerotek, Inc., No. 1:21-cv-1673 JLT CDB, 2024 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 35427, 2024 WL 863715 (E.D. Cal. 2024)
- Garcia v. Experian Information Solutions, Inc., 2024 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 44638, 2024 WL 1117912 (N.D. Cal. 2024)
- Ferrell v. Appfolio, Inc., 2024 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 4049, 2024 WL 132223 (C.D. Cal. 2024)
- Nguyen v. BMW of North America, LLC, 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 105585, 2021 WL 2284113 (S.D. Cal. 2021)