

1 **II. Legal Standards for Withdrawal of Counsel**

2 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:

7 Unless otherwise provided herein, an attorney who has appeared may not withdraw
8 leaving the client in propria persona without leave of court upon noticed motion and
9 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 **IV. Conclusion and Order**

26 Mr. Ravis has set forth sufficient reasons for the withdrawal. Therefore, the Court is acting
27
28

1 within its discretion to grant the motion to withdraw.¹ See LR 182. Accordingly, the Court

2 **ORDERS:**

- 3 1. The motion to withdraw (Doc. 155) is **GRANTED**;
- 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 a. Juaquin Coronado
c/o Lucia Martinez Coronado
10 245 N. Wicker
Littlefield, Texas 79339
- 11 b. Aaron Prange
c/o Natalie M. Amador
12 9571 Harle Avenue
13 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 ORDERED.

21 Dated: February 14, 2017

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
22 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

23

24

25

26

27

28 ¹ Because Mr. Ravis has sent mail to the last known addresses for Plaintiffs Corona and Prange, further notice of this motion would be useless.