

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS

Kevin R. Golden v. Hallcon Corporation

Golden · No. 25-CV-2775-EFM-TJJ · Decided February 27, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Kansas grants Hallcon Corporation’s motion to stay all pretrial deadlines pending resolution of its motion to enforce an alleged settlement agreement. The court concludes that discovery could be wasteful and burdensome because enforcement of the settlement could resolve or dismiss the action in its entirety.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Kansas
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Teresa J. Fames
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Kansas
DECIDED	February 27, 2026
DOCKET	25-CV-2775-EFM-TJJ
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant moved to stay all pretrial deadlines pending resolution of its motion to enforce an alleged settlement agreement from a prior employment-discrimination action. The plaintiff did not timely respond to the motion to stay.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The decision whether to stay discovery and other pretrial proceedings is committed to the trial court's sound discretion.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished, nonprecedential district court memorandum and order
PARTIES	Kevin R. Golden v. Hallcon Corporation

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure
- employment discrimination

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- employment law
- employment discrimination
- settlement enforcement

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should stay all pretrial proceedings and deadlines pending resolution of Hallcon's motion to enforce an alleged settlement agreement.
2. Whether the potential resolution of the case through enforcement of the alleged settlement constituted good cause for staying discovery and other pretrial proceedings.

HOLDINGS

1. A stay of all pretrial proceedings was appropriate because the motion to enforce settlement could conclude the matter in its entirety, and proceeding with discovery before that motion was resolved would be wasteful and burdensome.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Tenth Circuit, however, has held that “the right to proceed in court should not be denied except under the most extreme circumstances.”” (Memorandum and Order)

“A stay pending a ruling on a dispositive motion is appropriate if (1) the case is likely to be finally concluded via the dispositive motion; (2) the facts sought through discovery would not affect the resolution of the dispositive motion; (3) discovery on all issues posed by the complaint would be wasteful and burdensome; or (4) the dispositive motion raises issues as to a defendant’s immunity from suit.” (Memorandum and Order)

“Therefore, the Court finds the above-listed factors weigh in favor of staying all pretrial proceedings in this matter pending the District Judge’s ruling on Defendant’s Motion to Enforce Settlement.” (Memorandum and Order)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Golden was hired by Hallcon as a driver in January 2019 and filed this employment-discrimination action on December 30, 2025. He had previously sued Hallcon in the District of Kansas in Hallcon I. Hallcon alleged that the parties reached and Golden accepted a settlement resolving Hallcon I on November 10, 2025, but that Golden later refused to honor it. Because Hallcon's enforcement motion could result in dismissal of this action, the court concluded that discovery at this stage could be wasteful and burdensome.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Golden filed this employment-discrimination action on December 30, 2025. Hallcon asserted that the parties had settled Golden's prior action, Hallcon I, and moved to enforce that settlement and dismiss this case if the settlement were found binding. Hallcon separately moved to stay all pretrial proceedings pending resolution of the enforcement motion. The court granted the motion to stay.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Pet Milk Co. v. Ritter, 323 F.2d 586, 588 (10th Cir. 1963)

- *Kramer v. Textron Aviation, Inc.*, No. 20-2341-HLT-GEB, 2021 WL 4902249, at *3 (D. Kan. Oct. 21, 2021)
- *Clinton v. Jones*, 520 U.S. 681, 706-07 (1997)
- *Cont'l Ill. Nat. Bank & Tr. Co. of Chicago v. Caton*, 130 F.R.D. 145, 148 (D. Kan. 1990)
- *Commodity Futures Trading Comm'n v. Chilcott Portfolio Mgmt., Inc.*, 713 F.2d 1477, 1484 (10th Cir. 1983)
- *Cargill Meat Sols. Corp. v. Premium Beef Feeders, LLC*, No. 13-CV-1168-EFM-TJJ, 2015 WL 3937395, at *1 (D. Kan. June 26, 2015)
- *McDaniel v. Lakeview Vill., Inc.*, No. 23-2090-TC-TJJ, 2023 WL 4198601, at *1 (D. Kan. June 27, 2023)
- *Wolf v. United States*, 157 F.R.D. 494, 495 (D. Kan. 1994)
- *Tennant v. Miller*, No. 13-2143-EFM, 2013 WL 4848836, at *1 (D. Kan. Sept. 11, 2013)
- *McCoy v. United States*, No. 07-2097-CM, 2007 WL 2071770, at *2 (D. Kan. July 16, 2007)
- *Holroyd v. Dep't of Veterans Affairs*, No. 06-4133-SAC, 2007 WL 1585846, at *1 (D. Kan. June 1, 2007)
- *KetoNatural Pet Foods, Inc. v. Hill's Pet Nutrition, Inc.*, No. 24-CV-2046-KHV-ADM, 2024 WL 4274891, at *2 (D. Kan. Sept. 24, 2024)
- *Fattaey v. Kansas State Univ.*, No. 15-9314-JAR-KGG, 2016 WL 3743104, at *1-2 (D. Kan. July 13, 2016)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-kansas-united-states-district-court-for-the-district/2026/kevin-r-golden-v-hallcon-corporation-5qbwd1be>