1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	LARRY GIRALDES,	No. 2:14-cv-1780 CKD P
12	Plaintiff,	
13	V.	<u>ORDER</u>
14	JEFFREY BEARD,	
15	Defendant.	
16		
17	Before the court is plaintiff's July 15, 2015 motion for substitution of counsel. (ECF No.	
18	29.) In it, he asserts that "serious and irreconcilable conflict" exists between him and his	
19	attorney. (Id.) Plaintiff further asserts that "[t]he outcome desired by counsel, and the outcome	
20	desired by plaintiff, are at odds" and requests that the court appoint another attorney to represent	
21	him. ( <u>Id.</u> )	
22	On August 12, 2015, the court ordered plaintiff's counsel to respond to plaintiff's	
23	assertions. (ECF No. 30.) Plaintiff's appointed pro bono counsel, Mr. Reinach, has filed a	
24	response. (ECF No. 31.)	
25	Having reviewed this response, the court concludes that the conflict between plaintiff and	
26	his appointed counsel mainly concerns legal strategy and timing; that Mr. Reinach has experience	
27	litigating the issues in this lawsuit; and that he is diligently acting on plaintiff's behalf, although	
28	distance and scheduling issues have made in-	person contact difficult. As it appears that plaintiff's
		1

1	interests would be best served by continuing to retain Mr. Reinach, the court will deny plaintiff's	
2	motion for substitution of counsel. <sup>1</sup>	
3	Good cause appearing, the court will also extend the discovery and dispositive motion	
4	deadlines. (See ECF No. 31.)	
5	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:	
6	1. Plaintiff's motion for substitution of counsel (ECF No. 29) is denied;	
7	2. The discovery deadline in this action is extended to October 14, 2015.	
8	3. The dispositive motion deadline in this action is extended to December 18, 2015.	
9	Dated: August 26, 2015 Carop U. Delany	
10	CAROLYN K. DELANEY	
11	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
12		
13		
14	2/gira1780.ord(2)	
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27	<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff may renew his motion, but is cautioned that courts may decline to appoint counsel where a litigant has acted irresponsibly or unreasonably toward his or her prior counsel. <u>Hill v.</u>	
28	Hall, 818 F. Supp. 269, 272 (E.D. Wisc. 1993).	
	2	