

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

ASHLEY HALE,

Plaintiff,

v.

MANNA PRO PRODUCTS, LLC,

Defendant.

No. 2:18-cv-00209-KJM-DB

ORDER

Defendant Manna Pro Products, LLC is currently represented by four lead attorneys from three different law firms. On October 24, 2019, one of defendant's lead attorneys, Jennifer E. Hoekel, moved to withdraw as counsel for defendant, explaining she has transitioned to a new law firm effective October 7, 2019. Neither defendant nor plaintiff has opposed the motion. If Ms. Hoekel is permitted to withdraw as counsel, defendant will not be left *in propria persona*, but will continue to be represented by Armstrong Teasdale LLP and TroyGould PC.

Whether to grant a motion to withdraw is within the court's discretion. *Liang v. Cal-Bay Int'l, Inc.*, No. 06CV1082-WMC, 2007 WL 3144099, at \*1 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 24, 2007) (citing *LeGrand v. Stewart*, 133 F.3d 1253, 1269 (9th Cir. 1998)). Courts consider several factors when evaluating a motion to withdraw, including the reasons for withdrawal, possible prejudice to the client and other litigants, harm to the administration of justice and possible delay. *Deal v.*

1 *Countrywide Home Loans*, No. 09-01643, 2010 WL 3702459, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 15, 2010)  
2 (citation omitted).

3 Here, the court finds good cause exists for Ms. Hoekel to withdraw, and her  
4 withdrawal is not likely to prejudice any party or delay this litigation. Accordingly, the motion to  
5 withdraw is GRANTED.

6 This order resolves ECF No. 44. The Clerk is directed to amend the docket to  
7 reflect this change.

8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 DATED: December 5, 2019.

10   
11 \_\_\_\_\_  
12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28