requests for consolidation within sixteen days of the hearing (and decided seven of them within nine days). Accordingly, a finite stay of this action pending the JPML's decision will be brief and will not prejudice Plaintiffs in any respect. Indeed, when a stay is only in effect until the JPML issues a decision on transfer, courts have recognized that "there will be no extended delay in the commencement of discovery" and "[t]he plaintiffs will not be substantially prejudiced." *Am. Seafood, Inc. v. Magnolia Processing, Inc.*, Nos. 2:92-cv-01086 and 2:92-cv-01030, 1992 WL 102762, at *1 (E.D. Pa. May 7, 1992). *See also Bledsoe*, 2006 WL 335450, at *1 (commenting that "any delay [pending JPML action] is likely to be relatively short"); *Falgoust*, 2000 WL 462919, at *2 (noting that a plaintiff is not typically prejudiced by a "slight delay pending the JPML decision"). Any claim that a temporary stay will harm Plaintiffs is belied by the fact that Plaintiffs already have indicated their intent to amend the current complaint to add violations of the Texas Deceptive Trade Practice Act no sooner than March 31, 2010 – nearly a week after the JPML's Panel Hearing Session when it will consider the motions to centralize these cases.[4] *See* Compl. ¶ 50 (noting that "Plaintiffs … will request leave to add their [Texas Deceptive Trade Practices Act] cause of action" after the mandatory 60 day waiting period); Jan. 29, 2010 Letter from Hilliard Munoz Guerra LLP to Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc. re: Sylvia Pena and Albert A. Pena, III, et al. v. Toyota Motor Corporation and Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc., attached hereto as Exhibit D. By Plaintiffs' own admission, therefore, this action will not begin in earnest until at least March 31, 2010.

With respect to the second factor, even if Plaintiffs could somehow demonstrate prejudice

[4] Plaintiffs have served Toyota with a purported notice letter that is dated January 29, 2010, the date this action was filed. *See* Jan. 29, 2010 Letter from Hilliard Munoz Guerra LLP to Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc. re: Sylvia Pena and Albert A. Pena, III, et al. v. Toyota Motor Corporation and Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc., attached hereto as Exhibit D.