

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

SCOTT JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

MIKE PATEL, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:14-cv-02052-KJM-DB

ORDER

Defense counsel Michael D. Welch moved to withdraw as counsel, contending he has lost all contact with his client, Mike Patel. ECF No. 41 (filed June 16, 2017). But the applicable local rule mandates that before any such withdrawal, the attorney must “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.” E.D. Cal. L.R. 182(d). Neither Mr. Welch’s declaration nor his motion provides his client’s last known address and instead describes generally unanswered e-mails, phone calls and visits. *See* ECF Nos. 41, 41-1. Finding the detail insufficient, the court ordered Mr. Welch to file a supplemental rule-compliant brief. ECF No. 43 (issued Aug. 22, 2017). Receiving no response, the court ordered Mr. Welch to show cause within seven days why he should not be sanctioned \$250 for his non-compliance. ECF No. 44 (issued Sept. 19, 2017). The deadline has lapsed and Mr. Welch has yet to file any response.

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

Accordingly, the court SANCTIONS Mr. Welch in the amount of \$250, payable to the Clerk of the Court within fourteen days of this order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: October 2, 2017.


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE