Solannex,	Inc. v.	MiaSole, Inc.	Doc.	51
United States District Court For the Northern District of California				
	1			
	2			
	3			
	4			
	5			
	6			
	7			
	8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
	9	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
	10	SAN JOSE DIVISION		
	11	SOLANNEX, INC., Case Nos.: C 11-0171 PSG/12-0832PSG		
	12	Plaintiff, v. Plaintiff, ORDER GRANTING QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN LLP'S MOTION TO		
	13	v.) EMANUEL URQUHART &) SULLIVAN LLP'S MOTION TO MIASOLE, INC.,) WITHDRAW AS COUNSEL		
	14	Defendant.) (Re: Docket No. 46)		
	15	Defendant. (Re. Docket 110. 40)		
	16	In this notant infain coment out. Oning Emonyal Hasybort & Cullivan H.D. ("Oving")		
	17	In this patent infringement suit, Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan LLP ("Quinn"),		
	18	counsel to Defendant MiaSole, Inc. ("MiaSole"), moves to withdraw as counsel. Plaintiff		
	19	Solannex, Inc. ("Solannex") does not oppose the motion but requests that any withdrawal be		
	20	subject to certain conditions. On November 13, 2012, the parties appeared for hearing. Having		
	21	reviewed the papers and considered the arguments of counsel,		
	22	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Quinn's motion to withdraw is GRANTED.		
	23	Quinn seeks to withdraw as counsel to MiaSole due to non-payment of attorneys' fees and		
	24			
	25	costs and a breakdown in the attorney-client relationship. During the past several months, Quinn		
	26	has rendered certain legal services to MiaSole, including seeking discovery from Solannex,		
	27	responding to written discovery propounded by Solannex, conducting third-party discovery		
	28	1		
		Case Nos.: C 11-0771 PSG/C 12-0832 PSG		
		ORDER		

Dockets.Justia.com

(including multiple depositions), and engaging in settlement negotiations. MiaSole has not paid, however, any of the attorneys' fees and costs associated with these legal services. In addition, Quinn represents that there has been such a breakdown in the attorney-client relationship that Quinn can no longer provide effective representation to MiaSole. Quinn also notes that MiaSole should not be prejudiced by its withdrawal at this juncture in the case. Quinn informed MiaSole both orally and in writing that Quinn would seek to withdraw as counsel to MiaSole and from the case.

Solannex does not object to Quinn's withdrawal so long as withdrawal does not cause a further delay in trial. After Solannex requested that MiaSole be ordered to engage new counsel within fifteen days of any order granting Quinn's motion, new counsel for MiaSole from the Mayer Brown firm has entered its appearance.

The local rules in this district require that any attorney permitted to practice in this court be familiar with the standards of professional conduct required of members of the State Bar of California. These standards are contained in the California Rules of Professional Conduct. Pursuant to such rules, an attorney may seek to withdraw if the client renders it unreasonably difficult for the attorney to carry out employment effectively or if the client breaches an obligation to pay expenses or fees. Civ. L.R. 11-5 provides that counsel may not withdraw without a court order.

MiaSole has failed to fully pay attorneys' fees and costs that it has incurred thus far and Quinn describes a legitimate breakdown in the attorney-client relationship. Good cause therefore exists to allow Quinn to withdraw. A further scheduling order will follow.

Case Nos.: C 11-0771 PSG/C 12-0832 PSG OR DFR

¹ See Civ. L.R. 11-4(a).

² See id. at Commentary.

³ California Rule of Professional Conduct 3-700(C)(1)(d) and (f).

United States District Court For the Northern District of California

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Pore S. Aure Dated: 11/13/2012

PAUL S. GREWAL

United States Magistrate Judge

Case Nos.: C 11-0771 PSG/C 12-0832 PSG **ORDER**