acquired knowledge regarding this action and its pretrial procedures will be wasted."). With respect to the impact of this Court's actions on the transferee court, any efforts by this Court at case management will very likely have to be repeated by the judge to whom the multidistrict litigation is assigned. Not surprisingly, courts have often recognized that these concerns of judicial economy weigh in favor of a stay when a motion for transfer is pending before the JPML. *See Jackson*, 2006 WL 448695, at *1; *Bledsoe*, 2006 WL 335450, at *1; *The Gator Corp.*, 250 F. Supp. 2d at 428; *Arthur-Magna, Inc.*, 1991 WL 13725, at *1.

CONCLUSION

The issuance of a stay of proceedings in this Court pending the JPML's ruling on petitions for coordinated treatment will operate to the benefit of all – the plaintiffs, the defendants, and the respective courts in the more than seventy-five federal actions. Given the likelihood of the transfer of these cases for multidistrict coordination, the lack of prejudice to Plaintiff, the great risk of harm to Toyota, and the demands of judicial economy, Toyota respectfully urges this Court to stay all proceedings in this matter until the JPML rules on the transfer of this case for consolidated or coordinated pretrial proceedings pursuant 28 U.S.C. § 1407. For the convenience of the Court, a proposed Order is attached hereto.

Respectfully submitted this 4th day of March, 2010.

SIGNATURE PAGE TO FOLLOW