

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Lorelie Totanes v. Target Corporation

Totanes · No. 2:23-cv-01681-CDS-DJA · Decided December 4, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Nevada grants the parties’ joint motions to schedule a settlement conference and stay the case. The court refers the matter to a magistrate judge, vacates all pending deadlines, and directs the parties to submit a proposed joint pretrial order within thirty days if settlement efforts fail.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Cristina D. Silva
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
DECIDED	December 4, 2025
DOCKET	2:23-cv-01681-CDS-DJA
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties jointly moved for a settlement conference and to stay all pending deadlines, including the deadline for filing a joint pretrial order.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order
PARTIES	Lorelie Totanes v. Target Corporation

TOPICS

- mediation
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- settlement

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the court should refer the case for a settlement conference.
- Whether the court should stay or vacate pending deadlines, including the joint pretrial order deadline, while settlement efforts were pursued.

HOLDINGS

1. The court granted the parties' joint motions and referred the matter to a magistrate judge for a settlement conference.
2. All pending deadlines were vacated while the parties pursued settlement, and the parties were required to submit a proposed joint pretrial order within thirty days after the settlement conference if settlement efforts failed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The purpose of a settlement conference is to facilitate a settlement or to narrow the disparity between the parties by the candid input of a neutral, disinterested judicial officer.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The parties sought a settlement conference and a stay of all deadlines to allow an opportunity to resolve their claims. They represented that good cause existed for the requested stay because settlement efforts could facilitate resolution of the matter.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The case was pending in the United States District Court for the District of Nevada. The court granted the parties' joint motions, referred the matter to a magistrate judge for a settlement conference, vacated all pending deadlines, and directed the parties to submit a proposed joint pretrial order if settlement efforts failed.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Pitman v. Brinker Int'l, Inc., 216 F.R.D. 481, 485 (D. Ariz. 2003)