to their case due to the minimal delay, the very real hardship on Toyota in the absence of a stay substantially outweighs any alleged prejudice to Plaintiffs. If no stays issue, Toyota will be forced to continue litigating these suits in dozens of separate courts throughout the country, thereby imposing an enormous burden in terms of both time and resources on Toyota. Such effort would be particularly wasteful in a situation such as this one in which eventual consolidated treatment is almost certain. Additionally, because Plaintiffs intend to amend their complaint but, without any justification or explanation, refuse to agree to a simple extension of Toyota's time to respond, Toyota will be subjected to additional waste of time and resources absent a stay or, at a minimum, an extension of its time to respond to Plaintiffs' Complaint, because it will be forced to respond to multiple complaints in similar actions all relating to the very same issue. Even if waste of resources were no issue, by simultaneously litigating these cases, Toyota is subject to possibly conflicting substantive rulings on multiple aspects of these cases, including Toyota's motions to dismiss. In addition, any discovery in which Plaintiff s would engage pending transfer will be duplicative of the discovery engaged in by the plaintiffs in all other cases pending against Toyota. Accordingly, district courts have recognized that the risks and hardships now looming over Toyota are sufficient to warrant issuance of a stay. *See Jackson*, 2006 WL 448695, at *1; *The Gator Corp.*, 250 F. Supp. 2d at 428; *Nekritz,* 2004 WL 1462035, at *4; *U.S. Bank*, 2002 WL 31114069, at *2; *Falgoust*, 2000 WL 462919, at *1. Third, this Court's interest in judicial economy, not to mention that of the transferee court, militates in favor of a stay. If no stay issues before the JPML rules on coordination of these cases, this Court risks burdening its docket with a case that will require time, energy, and attention, but which ultimately may not remain with this Court's caseload. *See U.S. Bank*, 2002