

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BRUCE L. FULLER,
Plaintiff,
v.
J. EVANS, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No.14-cv-00304-HSG

**ORDER DIRECTING RESPONSE
FROM PLAINTIFF’S COUNSEL**

Re: Dkt. No. 126

Plaintiff Bruce Fuller was proceeding pro se in this case until August 1, 2017, when the Court appointed pro bono counsel. See Dkt. No. 99. Because Plaintiff is represented, only his attorneys should be in communication with the Court. See U.S. v. Mujahid, 799 F.3d 1228, 1236 (9th Cir. 2015) (finding that district court acted within its discretion in declining to grant request made pro se by a litigant who was then represented by counsel); McCullogh v. Graber, 726 F.3d 1057, 1059 n.1 (9th Cir. 2013) (declining to consider pro se filings by a represented plaintiff); Greenspan v. IAC/Interactivecorp, No. 14-cv-04187-RMW, 2016 WL 9185281, at *1 n.1 (“Pro se filings by a represented party are improper.”) (N.D. Cal. May 5, 2016) (citing U.S. v. Gwiazdzinski, 141 F.3d 784, 787 (7th Cir. 1998) and Mitchell v. Senkowski, 489 F. Supp. 2d 147, 150 (N.D.N.Y. 2006)). Nevertheless, on May 18, 2018, Plaintiff—apparently intending to act pro se—filed a motion to withdraw the civil complaint against Defendants, requesting that the court “vacate any[] and all further proceedings pertaining to this matter.” See Dkt. No. 126 at 1 (original emphasis).


//
//
//

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

The Court **DIRECTS** counsel for Plaintiff to respond to the May 18 filing. Plaintiff's counsel shall file a response of no more than three pages by May 29, 2018.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 5/23/2018


HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.
United States District Judge