

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
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ANTHONY PORRECA, et al.

 Plaintiffs,

 v.

FLOWERS BAKING CO. OF
CALIFORNIA, LLC,

 Defendant.

No. 1:15-cv-00732-DAD-MJS

ORDER REQUIRING MELLEN LAW FIRM
TO PROVIDE CLARIFICATION

Response Required in Two (2) Days

On May 19, 2016, plaintiffs’ counsel moved to withdraw as attorney for one of the plaintiffs in this matter, Arturo Gonzalez, citing “an irretrievable breakdown of communication.” (Doc. No. 53 at 2.) The motion was heard on June 21, 2016. The motion requested only that plaintiff’s counsel be allowed to withdraw as attorney for plaintiff Arturo Gonzalez. The motion did not indicate whether the Mellen Law Firm intends to remain as counsel of record for Gonzalez and Son, Inc., another named plaintiff which plaintiff Arturo Gonzalez “established and owns to operate as a distributor of Flowers Bakery.” (Doc. No. 50 at 4.)


Within two (2) days of this order, plaintiffs’ counsel is directed to file with the court a clarification indicating whether the Mellen Law Firm’s intends to remain or to seek withdrawal as counsel of record for Gonzalez and Son, Inc. If withdrawal is sought, the clarification must set out the grounds for withdrawal. The order to show cause discussed at

//////

1 the hearing on the motion to withdraw will not be issued until or unless plaintiffs' counsel
2 provides the clarification sought by the court.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 Dated: June 21, 2016



UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

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