48 F. Supp. 2d 37, 43 (D.D.C. 1999) (same); *Tench v. Jackson Nat'l Life Ins. Co.*, No. 99-C-5182, 1999 WL 1044923 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 12, 1999) (same); *Good v. Prudential Ins. Co. of Am.*, 5 F. Supp. 2d 804, 809 (N.D. Cal. 1998) (same); *Boudreaux v. Metro. Life Ins. Co.*, No. 95-138, 1995 WL 83788 (E.D. La. Feb. 24, 1995) (same); *Arthur-Magna, Inc. v. Del-Val Fin. Corp.*, No. 2:90cv04378, 1991 WL 13725, at *1 (D.N.J. Feb. 1, 1991) (granting stay because it fosters the purpose of the multidistrict litigation statute to coordinate related litigation).

Where a motion for transfer or notice of tag-along actions has been filed with the JPML, district courts have typically reviewed three factors to decide whether to stay pending proceedings until the JPML can rule. These factors are: (1) potential prejudice to the non-moving party if the stay is granted; (2) hardship to the moving party if the stay is not granted; and (3) the economical use of judicial resources. *See Jackson*, 2006 WL 448695, at *1; *Bledsoe*, 2006 WL 335450, at *1; *The Gator Corp.*, 250 F. Supp. 2d. at 426, 428; *Nekritz v. Canary Capital Partners, LLC*, No. 2:03-cv-05081, 2004 WL 1462035, at *1 (D.N.J. Oct. 27, 2003); *Bd. of Trustees of Teachers' Ret. Sys. of State of Ill. v. WorldCom, Inc.*, 244 F. Supp. 2d 900 (N.D. Ill. 2002); *U.S. Bank, N.A. v. Royal Indem. Co.*, No. 3:02-CV-0853-P, 2002 WL 31114069, at *2 (N.D. Tex. Sept. 23, 2002); *Falgoust*, 2000 WL 462919, at *2; *Rivers*, 980 F. Supp. at 1360; *Boudreaux*, 1995 WL 83788, at *1. Even where a non-moving party claims that a stay will cause delay and prejudice, "there are considerations of judicial economy and hardship to defendants that are compelling enough to warrant such a delay." *Arthur-Magna, Inc.*, 1991 WL 13725, at *1. *See also Krieger v. Merck & Co.*, 2005 WL 2921640, at *2 (W.D.N.Y. Nov. 4, 2005) (noting that "the risk of hardship to [the defendant] of engaging in duplicative motion practice and discovery proceedings outweighs any prejudice that could potentially inure to [the plaintiff]").

In the present case, all three considerations weigh heavily in favor of granting Toyota's motion for a stay. First, a finite, temporary stay of action in this case is unlikely to result in harm to Plaintiff. This lawsuit is in its infancy, and any