MDL Panel because of the judicial resources that are conserved."[3] *Rivers v. Walt Disney Co.*, 980 F. Supp. 1358, 1362 (C.D. Cal. 1997); *see also Gordillo v. Bank of Am., N.A.*, No. 1:09-cv-01954, 2010 WL 148699, at *2 (E.D. Cal. Jan. 14, 2010) (staying litigation pending a JPML ruling); *Dittman v. DJO, LLC*, No. 08-cv-02791, 2010 WL 174555, at *1 (D. Colo. Jan. 13, 2010) (same); *Lerch v. Davol Inc.*, No. 5:09-cv-130, 2009 WL 5217063, at *1 (W.D.N.C. Dec. 30, 2009) (same); *Jackson v. Merck & Co.*, No. 06-1004, 2006 WL 448695, at *1 (W.D. Tenn. Feb. 19, 2006) (same); *Bledsoe v. Pharm.*, No. 4:05CV02330, 2006 WL 335450, at *1 (E.D. Mo. Feb. 13, 2006) (same); *Hertz Corp. v. The Gator Corp.*, 250 F. Supp. 2d 421, 427-29 (D.N.J. 2003) (same); *Weinke v. Microsoft Corp.*, 84 F. Supp. 2d 989 (E.D. Wis. 2000) (same); *Falgoust v. Microsoft Corp.*, No. 00-0779, 2000 WL 462919 (E.D. La. Apr. 19, 2000) (same); *Aetna U.S. Healthcare, Inc. v. Hoechst Akiengesellschaft*, 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;

---

[3] A district court's authority to stay proceedings is well-established. It is "incidental to the power inherent in every court to control the disposition of the causes on its docket with economy of time and effort for itself, for counsel, and for litigants." *Landis v. N. Am. Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936).