

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
GREENVILLE DIVISION**

ANDREW ALEXANDER, et al.

PLAINTIFFS

V.

NO. 4:20-CV-21-DMB-JMV

PELICIA E. HALL, et al.

DEFENDANTS

ORDER STAYING CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS

Local Uniform Civil Rule 16(b)(3)(B) provides that “a motion asserting an immunity defense... stays the attorney conference and disclosure requirements and all discovery, pending the court’s ruling on the motion, including any appeal. Whether to permit discovery on issues related to a motion... [is a decision] committed to the discretion of the court, upon a motion by any party seeking relief.” L.U. Civ. R. 16(b)(3)(B).

The case was previously stayed per the Defendant’s motion to dismiss based on qualified immunity. [54]. On March 2, 2021, the court granted in part and denied the ruling on the motion to dismiss. [70]. The Defendants have filed a summary judgment motion based on qualified immunity. [77]. Accordingly, all the proceedings delineated in the rule will be stayed.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that the aforementioned proceedings are hereby **STAYED** pending a ruling on the immunity motion. Defendants shall notify the undersigned magistrate judge within seven (7) days of a decision on the immunity motion and shall submit a proposed order lifting the stay.

SO ORDERED this, the 2nd day of September, 2021.

/s/ Jane M. Virden

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE