

1 He requests that his previous, pro se motion for injunction be reconsidered, with his attorney
2 “being allowed to continue doing what he wants, when he wants, without plaintiff being involved
3 for the remainder of this case.” (Id. at 3.)

4 In a recent filing, plaintiff’s counsel points out that plaintiff’s ongoing pro se filings have
5 “created uncertainty as to Plaintiff’s relationship with his counsel and the scope of his authority.”
6 (ECF No. 42 at 3.) The court agrees. Plaintiff is advised that, if he continues to file pro se
7 motions, the court will look favorably upon any motion to withdraw filed by plaintiff’s attorney,
8 and plaintiff will litigate this action pro se. See Hill v. Hall, 818 F. Supp. 269, 272 (E.D. Wisc.
9 1993) (courts may decline to appoint counsel where a litigant has acted irresponsibly or
10 unreasonably toward his or her prior counsel).

11 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff’s motion for leave of court (ECF
12 No. 41) is denied.

13 Dated: February 8, 2016

14 
15 _____
16 CAROLYN K. DELANEY
17 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
18
19

20 2/gira1780.ord(3)
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28