

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

QUINTAL RESEARCH GROUP, INC.,
Plaintiff,
v.
NINTENDO OF AMERICA, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. [13-cv-00888-SBA](#) (JSC)

**ORDER TO WILLIAM R. HILL,
CAROLYN E. BARRENO, AND
DONAHUE FITZGERALD LLP TO
PROVIDE DECLARATION FOR IN
CAMERA REVIEW**

United States District Court
Northern District of California

Now pending before the Court is William R. Hill, Carolyn E. Barreno, and Donahue Fitzgerald LLP’s (“Movants”) motion to withdraw as counsel in the above-captioned matter. (Dkt. No. 67.) The motion is opposed by their client, Plaintiff Quintal Research Group, Inc. (Dkt. No. 69.) Although Movants assert that grounds for withdrawal exist under one or more of the grounds specified in the California Rules of Professional Conduct 3-700(C), Movants fail to describe at all the reasons for withdrawal. The Court cannot rule on the motion until it is made aware of the reason Movants are seeking to withdraw. *See Aceves v. Superior Court*, 51 Cal. App. 4th 584, 592-93 (1996) (holding that a court may not “rubber stamp” a withdrawal and that counsel has a duty to describe the “general nature” of the request “as fully as possible but within the confines of privilege”); *see also Zhixun Samuel Sun v. Rickenbacker Collection*, 2011 WL 1344413, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 8, 2011) (“When addressing a motion to withdraw, . . . the court must consider factors such as the reason counsel seeks to withdraw, the possible prejudice caused to the litigants, and the extent to which withdrawal may delay resolution of the case.”)

By no later than **Thursday, September 4, 2014**, Movants shall file a declaration, for the Court’s *in camera* review, setting forth the general nature of the basis for the motion. Movants shall also serve the *in camera* declaration on Plaintiff. Plaintiff need not respond to the

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

declaration. The Court sets a hearing on the motion for **Thursday, September 11, 2014 at 9:30 a.m.**

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 28, 2014



JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY
United States Magistrate Judge