

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA – FRESNO DIVISION

PAULO EUGENE GUINN,

CASE NO. 1:10-cv-00320-LJO-SKO

Plaintiff,

**ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR
SUBSTITUTION OF ATTORNEY AS
MOOT**

v.

J. STURM, et al.,

Defendants.

(Docket No. 24)

On December 2, 2010, counsel for defendants J. Sturm, A. Bigham, County of Mariposa, and Brian Muller ("Defendants") filed a request for a substitution of attorney. However, the substitution request appears to be a notice of change of firm name rather than a change in attorney representation. Ms. Kimberly Flores will continue to represent Defendants, but the name of the firm with which she is associated is changed from Allen, Fagalde, Albertoni & Flores, LLP to Fagalde, Albertoni & Flores, LLP.

A request for substitution of attorneys is not the proper vehicle to notice the Court of a firm name change. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(b), "[a]ppearances as an attorney of record shall not be made in the name of the firm, organization, public entity, agency, or department." *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 11. Rather, an appearance is made by the individual attorney representing the party. Here, that has not changed.

///

1 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

2 1. The Defendants' request for substitution of attorneys is DENIED as moot; and

3 2. The Clerk of Court is directed to update the CM/ECF docket to reflect the changed
4 firm name associated with Defendants' counsel of record as noted above.

5
6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 **Dated: December 10, 2010**

/s/ Sheila K. Oberto
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE