

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Julie Galvez, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated v.
Hilton Resorts Corporation

Galvez · No. 2:24-cv-02147-CDS-BNW · Decided December 10, 2025

SUMMARY

The document is a stipulation and order in a putative class and collective action between Julie Galvez and Hilton Resorts Corporation. The parties jointly request a 62-day stay of proceedings to allow private mediation and exchange of pay and time records, with a status report due within 14 days after the stay expires.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
DECIDED	December 10, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-cv-02147-CDS-BNW
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties jointly stipulated to a stay of all proceedings to permit private mediation, and the district court entered the stipulated stay.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A district court has inherent authority to stay proceedings and evaluates a stay by balancing potential prejudice, hardship or inequity, and the orderly and economical course of justice.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential

TOPICS

- mediation
- class actions
- civil procedure
- discovery dispute

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- employment law
- class actions
- alternative dispute resolution

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether good cause existed to stay all proceedings for 62 days while the parties continued private mediation.

HOLDINGS

1. The court granted the parties' joint request and stayed all proceedings through February 10, 2026, because the parties' continued mediation could simplify or resolve the litigation, the parties identified avoidable litigation hardship, and no prejudice was shown.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“[T]he power to stay proceedings is incidental to the power inherent in every court to control the dispositions of the causes on its docket with economy of time and effort for itself, for counsel, and for litigants.” (at 2)

“A trial court may, with propriety, find it is efficient for its own docket and the fairest course for the parties to enter a stay of an action before it, pending resolution of independent proceedings which bear upon the case.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The parties were pursuing private mediation in a putative class and collective action. The mediation was rescheduled from December 10, 2025, to February 10, 2026, in part to allow additional time to exchange extensive pay and time records. The parties represented that a stay would avoid unnecessary litigation costs and preserve judicial resources, and that neither side would be prejudiced.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a putative class and collective action against Hilton Resorts Corporation. The parties requested a fourth stay of the case so they could continue mediation and exchange pay and time records; the court approved a 62-day stay through February 10, 2026, and required a joint status report afterward.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Landis v. North American Co., 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936)
- Pate v. DePay Orthopedics, Inc., No. 2:12-cv-01168-MMD-CWH, 2012 WL 3532780, at *2 (D. Nev. Aug. 14, 2012)
- Coker v. Dowd, No. 2:13-cv-0994-JCM-NJK, 2013 WL 12216682, at *1 (D. Nev. July 8, 2013)
- Lockyer v. Mirant Corp., 398 F.3d 1098, 1110 (9th Cir. 2005)

OPINION

Galvez

PER CURIAM.

1 || Montgomery Y. Paek, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 10176 2 Amy L. Thompson, Esq. 3 || Nevada Bar No. 11907 Andrew S. Clark, Esq. 4 || Nevada Bar No. 14854 LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C. 5 ||

3960 Howard Hughes Parkway Suite 300 6 || Las Vegas, Nevada 89169.5937 Telephone:
702.862.8800 7 Fax No.: 702.862.8811 mpaek@littler.com 8 || athompson@littler.com
asclark@littler.com 9 Attorneys for Defendant

10 | HILTON RESORTS CORPORATION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

JULIE GALVEZ, on behalf of herself and all Case No. 2:24-cv-02147-CDS-BNW 13 others
similarly situated, Plaintiff STIPULATION AND ORDER TO

14 m STAY PROCEEDINGS

15 |v. J]FOURTH REQUEST]

16 || HILTON RESORTS CORPORATION,

[ECF No. 21] 17 Defendant 18 19 20 Plaintiff Julie Galvez and Defendant Hilton Resorts
Corporation hereby stipulate and agree 21 |! to stay all proceedings in this matter for 62 days, up to
and including February 10, 2026, to allow 22 || the parties to participate in a private mediation in
this matter. Since the parties' last request to stay 23 || proceedings, they have agreed to continue
the mediation in this matter to February 10, 2026, to 24 |! allow additional time to exchange
extensive pay and time records for the putative class and 25 || collective before mediation. The
requested stay would include all current deadlines, including the 26 || current deadline for
Defendant to file a response to Plaintiffs First Amended Complaint (ECF No. 27 || 8) and the
deadline for the Parties to file a Joint Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order. 28

MENDELSON, P.C

1 The purpose of this stipulation is to promote judicial economy and permit this Court to 2
effectively control the disposition of cases on its docket with economy of time and effort for itself,
3 counsel, and the litigants. See *Landis v. N. Am. Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936) (“[T]he power to
4 stay proceedings is incidental to the power inherent in every court to control the dispositions of
the 5 causes on its docket with economy of time and effort for itself, for counsel, and for
litigants.”); 6 *Pate v. DePay Orthopedics, Inc.*, No. 2:12-cv-01168-MMD-CWH, 2012 WL
3532780, *2 (D. Nev.

7 Aug. 14, 2012) (“A trial court may, with propriety, find it is efficient for its own docket and the
8 fairest course for the parties to enter a stay of an action before it, pending resolution of
independent 9 proceedings which bear upon the case.”) (internal citations omitted). In evaluating
whether to stay 10 proceedings, the Court considers the competing interests of the parties and of
the Court, including 11 “‘possible damage which may result in granting the stay, the hardship or
inequity which a party 12 may suffer in being required to go forward, and the orderly course of
justice measured in terms of 13 simplifying or complicating of issues, proof, and questions of law
which could expected to result 14 from a stay.’” *Coker v. Dowd*, No. 2:13-cv-0994-JCM-NJK,
2013 WL 12216682, *1 (D. Nev. Jul. 15 8, 2013) (granting joint motion to stay all proceedings
pending mediation), quoting *Lockyer v. 16 Mirant Corp.*, 398 F.3d 1098, 1110 (9th Cir. 2005). 17

The Parties initially scheduled a private mediation in this matter for December 10, 2025, but, due to unforeseen issues, Defendant requested to continue the mediation. After consulting with Plaintiff and the private mediator, the parties agreed to reschedule the mediation on February 10, 2026, and are therefore actively exploring alternative dispute resolution to potentially resolve this litigation entirely. As this is a putative class action, such exploration is more complex and time consuming. The Parties believe that, through their efforts, they may be able to resolve the matter and avoid unnecessary litigation costs and the unnecessary use of judicial resources. Based on the foregoing, the Parties agree that their interests are aligned in seeking to potentially resolve this matter entirely without expending unnecessary litigation costs and efforts, and that neither Plaintiff nor Defendant will be prejudiced by a stay of the proceedings. The Parties also agree that they will each suffer an avoidable hardship – time and money spent litigating – if the matter is required to proceed at this stage considering the Parties’ agreement to explore a potential resolution. Lastly, the Parties respectfully submit that staying all proceedings will avoid expending judicial resources in the event that they simplify or entirely dispose of the issues in this action. Accordingly, the Parties agree and stipulate that good cause exists to stay all proceedings as requested herein. The Parties will file a joint status report informing the Court of the outcome of their efforts to resolve Plaintiffs claims within fourteen (14) days of the expiration of this stay: 1. Should the Parties reach a settlement of all claims, the Parties will update the Court as to the tentative resolution and set forth a proposed briefing schedule for settlement approval; or 2. Should the Parties be unsuccessful at resolving all claims, the Parties shall inform the Court which, if any, claims were not resolved and propose a scheduling order for the matter to proceed, including for Defendant’s response to the Plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint, issuance of a putative class list, and notification to the putative collective. This stipulation is submitted in good faith to allow the parties to potentially resolve the matter entirely and is not for the purpose of causing any undue delay. This is the fourth request to stay this case. Dated: December 10, 2025 Dated: December 10, 2025 8 Respectfully submitted, Respectfully submitted, 19 /s/ Leah L. Jones /s/ Andrew S. Clark 20 || Joshua D. Buck, Esq. Montgomery Y. Paek, Esq. Leah L. Jones, Esq. Amy L. Thompson, Esq. 21 || THIERMAN BUCK Andrew S. Clark, Esq. Attorneys for Plaintiff LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C. 22 || JULIE GALVEZ Attorney for Defendant
53 HILTON RESORTS CORPORATION
ITISSOO RED. 25
26
7 D STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
28 ted: _December 10, 2025