

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
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ALFRED LAM, et al.,

Plaintiff(s),

No. C 10-4641 PJH

v.

**ORDER DENYING SUBSTITUTION
OF COUNSEL**

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN
FRANCISCO, et al.,

Defendant(s).

_____ /


On April 28, 2014, plaintiffs in the above-captioned matter filed a proposed order substituting themselves as counsel, in pro per. However, while the proposed order appears to contain four signatures (presumably, one for each of the four plaintiffs), the proposed order lists contact information for only one plaintiff, Alfredo Lam. Mr. Lam may represent only himself, and may not represent any of the other three plaintiffs. Plaintiffs' request is thus DENIED. If each plaintiff wishes to represent himself or herself in pro per, each plaintiff must submit a separate substitution of attorney request, and must provide their own contact information.

The court advises plaintiffs that all four of them must appear in person at the next case management conference, scheduled for May 29, 2014 at 2:00pm.

The court also notes that Smith Patten is still listed as counsel of record for plaintiffs, as no motion to withdraw as counsel has been filed. Until plaintiffs are properly substituted in as counsel in pro per, Smith Patten is directed to serve a copy of this and any subsequent orders on plaintiffs. See Civil Local Rule 11-5(b).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 6, 2014



PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON
United States District Judge

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California