

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Clark County, et al. v. United States District Court

Clark County · No. Docket No. 109 · Decided January 22, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Nevada grants Defendants' motion to stay discovery pending resolution of their motions to dismiss. If the case is not terminated, the parties must submit a joint proposed discovery schedule within 21 days after the motions to dismiss are resolved.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Nancy J. Koppe
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
DECIDED	January 22, 2026
DOCKET	Docket No. 109
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendants moved to stay discovery pending resolution of their fully briefed motions to dismiss. The court granted the motion to stay discovery.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; persuasive value only
PARTIES	Clark County, et al. v. United States District Court

TOPICS

discovery dispute

motions to dismiss

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether discovery should be stayed pending resolution of defendants' motions to dismiss.

HOLDINGS

1. A stay of discovery was warranted while the fully briefed motions to dismiss were pending, so the court granted defendants' motion.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“If resolution of the motions to dismiss does not result in termination of this case, the parties must file a joint proposed discovery schedule within 21 days of the issuance of the order(s) resolving the motions to dismiss.”
(at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The case was at the discovery stage while defendants' motions to dismiss were pending and fully briefed. Defendants sought a stay of discovery, with a joinder filed by another defendant. The court concluded that a discovery stay was warranted pending resolution of the motions to dismiss.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Defendants filed a motion to stay discovery and another defendant joined the motion. Plaintiff filed a response, and defendants filed a reply. After considering the governing standards and conducting a preliminary peek at the pending motions to dismiss, the court granted the stay.

DISPOSITION

other

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

If resolution of the motions to dismiss does not terminate the case, the parties must file a joint proposed discovery schedule within 21 days after issuance of the order or orders resolving the motions to dismiss.

CASES CITED

- Kor Media Group, LLC v. Green, 294 F.R.D. 579, 581-83 (D. Nev. 2013)
- Blaisdell v. Frappiea, 729 F.3d 1237, 1241 (9th Cir. 2013)
- Tradebay, LLC v. eBay, Inc., 278 F.R.D. 597, 603 (D. Nev. 2011)

OPINION

1 2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 3 DISTRICT OF NEVADA 4 6 Plaintiff(s), Order 7] [Docket No. 109] 81 Clark County, et al., 9 Defendant(s). 10 Pending before the Court is Defendants' motion to stay discovery pending resolution of 11] their motions to dismiss. Docket No. 109; Docket No. 112 (joinder).! Plaintiff filed a response. 12 Docket No. 117.2 Defendants filed a reply.

Docket No. 118. Having considered the governing 13} standards, Kor Media Group, LLC v. Green, 294 F.R.D. 579, 581-83 (D. Nev. 2013), the Court 14} finds that a stay of discovery is

warranted.> Accordingly, the Court GRANTS Defendants' motion 15] to stay discovery. If resolution of the motions to dismiss does not result in termination of this case, 16] the parties must file a joint proposed discovery schedule within 21 days of the issuance of the 17] order(s) resolving the motions to dismiss.

18 IT IS SO ORDERED. 19 Dated: January 22, 2026 20 A Eo Nancy J.Ko 21 United States Magistrate Judge 22 23 ' The underlying motions to dismiss have been fully briefed. 24 The Court liberally construes the filings of pro se litigants, particularly those who are 35 prisoners bringing civil rights claims. *Blaisdell v. Frappiea*, 729 F.3d 1237, 1241 (9th Cir. 2013). > Conducting the preliminary peek puts the undersigned in an awkward position because 26] the assigned district judge will decide the underlying motions and may have a different view of the merits.

See *Tradebay, LLC v. eBay, Inc.*, 278 F.R.D. 597, 603 (D. Nev. 2011). The 27] undersigned's "preliminary peek" at the merits of the motions to dismiss is not intended to prejudice their outcome. See *id.* The undersigned carefully reviewed the arguments presented in the underlying motions and related briefing, but will not provide discussion of the merits herein.