UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

In re: Target Corporation Customer Data Security Breach Litigation,

MDL No. 14-2522 (PAM/JJK)

This document relates to all CONSUMER and BANK actions.

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Defendants' Motion to Stay Discovery. For the reasons that follow, the Motion is denied.

Defendants contend that discovery should be stayed pending resolution of not-yet-filed motions to dismiss. Rule 26 allows the Court to stay discovery "for good cause." Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c). Defendants have failed to establish good cause for delaying discovery in this matter.

The Court has determined that discovery in this complex case should proceed and has set an ambitious schedule for that discovery. (See Scheduling Orders (Docket Nos. 93, 94) (setting July 1, 2015, as deadline for fact discovery).) Staying discovery pending the motions to dismiss will only serve to delay the expeditious prosecution of this action.

Defendants note that any motions to dismiss will be fully briefed by the end of October in the bank cases and the end of November in the consumer cases. Discovery is not scheduled to commence until September. Given the Court's practice of issuing rulings on dispositive motions within one month of the hearing date, if not sooner, discovery will have proceeded for only a few months by the time the Court rules on Defendants' motions. Ninety

days' worth of discovery does not impose such a burdensome expense to warrant disturbing the case's schedule.

Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that** Defendants' Motion to Stay Discovery (Docket No. 125) is **DENIED**.

Dated: July 24, 2014

s/ Paul A. Magnuson
Paul A. Magnuson
United States District Court Judge