1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	NICOLE LYON,	No. 1:16-cv-00401-DAD-SKO	
12	Plaintiff,		
13	v.	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND	
14	BERGSTROM LAW, LTD.,	RECOMMENDATIONS (D. N. 21)	
15	Defendant.	(Doc. No. 31)	
16			
17	Plaintiff Nicole Lyon filed this action on March 24, 2016, alleging claims for damages		
18	against defendant Bergstrom Law Ltd., a law firm, for violations of (1) the Fair Debt Collections		
19	Practices Act ("FDCPA"), 15 U.S.C. §§ et seq., and (2) the Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection		
20	Practices Act ("Rosenthal Act"), Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1788-1788.32. (Doc. No. 1.) On January 17,		
21	2017, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations recommending that		
22	defendant's answer be stricken and the Clerk of Court be directed to enter default against		
23	defendant. (Doc. No. 31.) The findings and recommendations were served on defendant's curren		
24	counsel of record via the Court's Case Management/Electronic Case File system, see Local Rules		
25	135 and 137, with instructions that any objections thereto must be filed by January 31, 2017.		
26	/////		
27	/////		
28	/////		

1	On January 19, 2017, defendant's counsel of record, Katherine Heidbrink, filed a		
2	"Declaration Regarding Representation." (Doc. No. 32.) ¹ The court will construe this filing as		
3	defendant's objections to the pending findings and recommendations, however, defendant's		
4	counsel's filing does not discuss any of the underlying issues addressed in the pending findings		
5	and recommendations and provides no basis upon which the court should decline to adopt them.		
6	(Doc. No. 31.) As such, plaintiff's objections to defendant's filing (Doc. No. 33) are overruled.		
7	In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this court has conducted a		
8	de novo review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court finds that the		
9	findings and recommendations are supported by the record and proper analysis.		
10	Accordingly,		
11	1. The January 17, 2017 findings and recommendations (Doc. No. 31) are adopted in full;		
12	2. Defendant's answer (Doc. 19) is stricken; and		
13	/////		
14	/////		
15			
16	¹ In that filing attorney Heidbrink states that as of July 19, 2016, she is no longer employed be defendant, that she and defendant agreed that defendant "would have its new counsel substitut		
17	into all of [her] existing cases as quickly as possible," and that "she is not authorized to file or		
18	behalf of [defendant] or withdraw its appearance in this case." (Doc. No. 32 ¶¶ 4, 8, 14.) The docket reflects however that attorney Heidbrink has neither submitted a "substitution of		

er employed by unsel substitute rized to file on 4, 8, 14.) The 'substitution of docket reflects, however, that attorney Heidbrink has neither submitted a attorneys" under Local Rule 182(g), nor filed a motion for leave to withdraw as counsel of record pursuant to Local Rule 182(d). Until she either substitutes another attorney into this action on defendant's behalf or is granted leave to withdraw, attorney Heidbrink continues to serve as defendant's counsel of record, regardless of her employment status. To the extent that attorney Heidbrink is suggesting that defendant was not served with the court's findings and recommendations through the Court's CM/ECF system, that suggestion is belied by her own declaration in which she states:

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

[Defendant]'s employees set up a system wherein both the firm and I would receive email notification regarding any filing in any case that used my e-filing credentials. For instance, my e-filing credentials for this court send email notice directly to my personal email (kheidbrink@gmail.com), as well as to [defendant] (at mbardis@jbergstromlaw.com).

(Doc. No. 32 ¶ 8; see also id. ¶ 10 ("Additionally, since leaving [defendant], I have promptly forwarded notice intended for my former firm in whatever form is appropriate. This includes ECF notifications for pleadings in this case.").

1	3. The Clerk of Court is directed to enter default against defendant.	
2		C
3	IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: March 29, 2017	Dale A. Drogd
5		UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		