

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

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.