1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	DUBRIN et al.,	) Case No.: 1:11-cv-01484 DAD JLT	
12	Plaintiffs,	) ORDER DISCHARGING ORDER TO SHOW ) CAUSE AND GRANTING REQUEST OF	
13	v.	ATTORNEY MARK RAVIS TO WITHDRAW AS COUNSEL OF RECORD FOR JOAQUIN	
14	MICHAEL STAINER, et al.,	) CORONADO AND AARON PRANGE ) (Docs. 155, 158)	
15	Defendants.	) ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE TO PLAINTIFFS	
16		<ul> <li>CORONADO AND PRANGE WHY THE</li> <li>MATTER SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR</li> <li>THER EALLUEE TO PROSECUTE THE</li> </ul>	
17		) THEIR FAILURE TO PROSECUTE THE ) ACTION	
18			
19	I. Background		
20	At a settlement conference in October, 2016, counsel agreed in principle to settle this matter.		
21	(Doc. 82.) However, settlement was contingent upon agreement by all named plaintiffs. Id.		
22	Plaintiffs' counsel had not had contact with several of the named plaintiffs for years. (Doc. 91, at 2.)		
23	As to five of these absent plaintiffs, the Court has granted the request of attorney, Mark Ravis, to		
24	withdraw from their representation. (Docs. 100, 133.) Now, Mr. Ravis seeks to withdraw from the		
25	representation of Joaquin Coronado and Aaron Prange. (Doc. 159.) Mr. Ravis reports that he has		
26	spent several months trying to contact them but has received no response to correspondence sent to		
27	their last known addresses. Id. at 3.		
28	///		

2

8

9

1

II.

## Legal Standards for Withdrawal of Counsel

Withdrawal of counsel is governed by the Rules of Professional Conduct of the State Bar of 3 California and the Local Rules of the United States District Court, Eastern District of California. See 4 LR 182. Withdrawal is permitted under the Rules of Professional Conduct if a client "renders it 5 unreasonably difficult for the member to carry our employment effectively." Cal. R.P.C. 3-6 700(C)(1)(d). Local Rule 182(d) provides: Unless otherwise provided herein, an attorney who has appeared may not withdraw 7

leaving the client in propria persona without leave of court upon noticed motion and notice to the client and all other parties who have appeared. The attorney shall provide an affidavit stating the current or last known address or addresses of the client and the efforts made to notify the client of the motion to withdraw.

10 Id. Likewise, California's Rules require the moving attorney to serve notice of motion and the 11 declaration and other parties who have appeared in the case. CRC 3.1362(d).

12 The decision to grant withdrawal is within the discretion of the Court, and withdrawal "may be 13 granted subject to such appropriate conditions as the Court deems fit." LR 182; see Canandaigua Wine 14 Co., Inc. v. Moldauer, 2009 WL 989141, at \*1 (E.D. Cal. Jan. 13, 2009) ("The decision to grant or deny 15 counsel's motion to withdraw is committed to the discretion of the trial court."). Factors the Court may 16 consider include: (1) the reasons for withdrawal, (2) prejudice that may be caused to the other litigants, 17 (3) harm caused to the administration of justice; and (4) delay to the resolution of the case caused by 18 withdrawal. Canandaigua Wine Co., 2009 WL 989141, at \*1-2

19

## III. **Discussion and Analysis**

20 Mr. Ravis' declaration demonstrates that the attorney-client relationship has broken down such 21 that he has no option but to withdraw. (Doc. 155, at 3.) Mr. Ravis has had no contact with Mr. 22 Coronado or Mr. Prange for some time and he has spent several months trying to locate them. Id. 23 These efforts have failed. Id. Because these plaintiffs have failed to maintain contact with their 24 lawyer, it appears that they have abandoned this litigation.

25 26

27

28

## IV. **Conclusion and Order**

Mr. Ravis has set forth sufficient reasons for the withdrawal. Therefore, the Court is acting

1	within its di	scretion to grant the motion to withdraw. <sup>1</sup> See LR 182. Accordingly, the Court	
2	<b>ORDERS</b> :		
3	1.	The motion to withdraw (Doc. 155) is <b>GRANTED</b> ;	
4	2.	The order to show cause, which issued on February 6, 2017 (Doc. 158) is	
5		DISCHARGED;	
6	3.	The Clerk's Office SHALL TERMINATE Mark Ravis as counsel of record for	
7		Plaintiffs Joaquin Coronado and Aaron Prange, and update the docket to reflect these	
8		Plaintiffs' self-represented status and their last known addresses as follows:	
9 10		a. Juaquin Coronado c/o Lucia Martinez Coronado 245 N. Wicker	
10		Littlefield, Texas 79339	
11		b. Aaron Prange c/o Natalie M. Amador	
12		9571 Harle Avenue Anaheim, CA 92804	
14	4.	Within 21 days, Plaintiffs Joaquin Coronado and Aaron Prange SHALL show cause in	
15		writing why this action should not be dismissed for their apparent abandonment of this	
16		action and their failure to prosecute it.	
17	Plaintiffs Joaquin Coronado and Aaron Prange are advised that their failure to appear in		
18	this action and to comply with any order of the Court may result in the action being dismissed.		
19			
20	IT IS SO OI	RDERED.	
21	Dated:	February 14, 2017 /s/ Jennifer L. Thurston	
22		UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28	<sup>1</sup> Because Mr. motion would	Ravis has sent mail to the last known addresses for Plaintiffs Corona and Prange, further notice of this be useless.	