

On May 10, 2012, counsel for Plaintiff Leon Meyers moved to withdraw, citing fundamental differences of opinion between counsel and Plaintiff with regards to the handling of the case, and an overall breakdown in the attorney-client relationship. On May 16, 2012, this Court issued an order requiring a response from Plaintiff Leon L. Meyers, which the Court received on May 24, 2012, well ahead of the set filing deadline. Plaintiff's counsel responded on June 14, 2012, and on July 2, 2012, an *in camera* hearing was held to further examine the issues raised by counsel in their motion to withdraw.

The Court has devoted considerable thought to this matter, carefully considering the briefs of counsel, the statements of Plaintiff, and conferring with Magistrate Judge Vadas, who oversaw prior settlement discussions in this case. After a thorough review of the record, it does not appear that the differences between Plaintiff and his counsel are quite so irreconcilable as the motion of counsel suggests, and therefore the Court has determined that the most productive and efficient course of action in this case would be for the parties to engage in one further attempt at settlement.

The parties are therefore directed to schedule one further settlement conference with Judge Vadas, at his convenience and at the convenience of the parties involved. The motion

Dockets.Justia.com

to withdraw is DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE. A further settlement conference shall be
 scheduled and held within 90 days of the issuance of this Order.

3 If, after the further conference is held, settlement remains elusive, and counsel still
4 feels that withdrawal is the appropriate course of action, then counsel is welcome to re-file
5 their motion for withdraw, and the Court will reconsider whether withdrawal is appropriate.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 Dated: 7/18/12

Halla

THELTON E. HENDERSON, JUDGE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT