

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

CAT BROOKS and RASHEED SHABAZZ,
individually and on behalf of all others similarly
situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

THOMSON REUTERS CORPORATION,

Defendant.

Case No. 3:21-cv-1418-EMC

**[PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING
MOTION TO STAY DISCOVERY**

1 Before the Court is Defendant Thomson Reuters Corporation's motion to stay discovery.
2 Docket No. 37. Having considered the parties' briefing and oral argument, the Court denies the
3 motion on the merits.

4 Thomson Reuters' motion is denied because the Court is not "convinced" that
5 Plaintiffs will be unable to state a claim for relief. *See Wood v. McEwen*, 644 F.2d 797, 801 (9th
6 Cir. 1981). Also, the motion is denied because Thomson Reuters has failed to demonstrate good
7 cause to stay discovery pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c)(1). *See Smith v. Levine*
8 *Leichtman Cap. Partners, Inc.*, 2011 WL 13153189, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 11, 2011).

9 Accordingly, discovery on all claims is to proceed.

10
11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12
13 Dated: _____, 2021

14 _____
15 Hon. Edward M. Chen
16 United States District Judge
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28