MDL, the need for a stay of this action to promote the purposes of coordinated MDL treatment is equally compelling. Any action by this Court prior to such transfer would be wasteful of the Court's valuable judicial resources and would create the possibility of inconsistencies in the adjudication of dozens of overlapping class actions. Toyota, therefore, requests that this Court stay all proceedings in the present case until the JPML has ruled on the transfer of this case for consolidated or coordinated pretrial proceedings. Indeed, Courts have already entered orders staying at least nine (9) related actions pursuant to a similar request by Toyota, *see* Exhibit D, and consent motions to stay are currently being presented to several additional federal courts. Toyota respectfully suggests that the same rationale applies here.

ARGUMENT AND AUTHORITY

The principle purposes of multidistrict coordination are to further judicial economy, minimize duplicative discovery activity, and eliminate the potential for conflicting pretrial rulings. *See, e.g., In re N.Y. City Mun. Sec. Litig.*, 572 F.2d 49, 51-52 (2d Cir. 1978). These objectives obviously would not be served if, notwithstanding a motion for multidistrict coordination of these cases, courts allowed the matters to proceed, inviting precisely the sorts of waste and inconsistencies that the multidistrict litigation process is designed to prevent. Not surprisingly, "[a] majority of courts have concluded that it is often appropriate to stay preliminary pretrial proceedings while a motion to transfer and consolidate is pending with the 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

[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).