delay in the preliminary proceedings would be brief. For example, following its last hearing on January 27, 2010, the JPML decided all nine 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. Indeed, if the 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").

With respect to the second factor, even if Plaintiff could somehow demonstrate prejudice to his case due to this minimal delay, the very real hardship on Toyota in the absence of a stay substantially outweighs any alleged prejudice to Plaintiff. If no stay issues, 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.

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 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,