

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Lopez v. Harley-Davidson, Inc.

Lopez · No. 24-cv-04320-RS · Decided September 30, 2025

OPINION

Lopez v. Harley-Davidson, Inc.

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

8 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9 OKSANA LOPEZ, et al., 10 Case No. 24-cv-04320-RS Plaintiffs, 11

v. ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR

12 STAY OF PROCEEDINGS

HARLEY-DAVIDSON, INC.,

13 Defendant. 14

15 16 Defendant Harley-Davidson, Inc. seeks a stay of all other proceedings in this action 17
pending a ruling on its motion for terminating sanctions, which is based on the fact that plaintiffs'
18 counsel directed a third-party storage facility to dispose of the motorcycle decedent was riding
in 19 the incident giving rise to this action. Harley-Davidson has not met its burden to show that a
stay 20 is warranted. See generally, Mlejnecky v. Olympus Imaging Am., Inc., 2011 WL 489743,
at *7-10 21 (E.D. Cal. Feb. 7, 2011). The stay motion is therefore denied. 22 The assigned
magistrate judge appropriately denied a motion to compel, without prejudice, 23 pending a
determination as to whether a stay would issue. In light of this denial, the parties should 24
proceed as directed by the magistrate judge. The magistrate judge retains full discretion to 25
determine if and when the disputed discovery should go forward. Although plaintiffs have 26
suggested the outstanding discovery could be relevant to some of the issues in the pending 27
sanctions motion, plaintiffs shall file their opposition to the sanctions motion as currently 1
motion, an order to that effect will issue, but the parties should presume the sanctions motion will
2 || be decided on the current record. 3 4 || ITISSO ORDERED. 5 6 || Dated: September 30, 2025 7

RICHARD SEEBORG

8 Chief United States District Judge 9 10 11 a 12 16 Z 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 CASE
No. 24-cv-04320-RS