

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  
SAN JOSE DIVISION**

HUGO MADRID, ET AL.,  
Plaintiffs,  
v.  
TELENETWORK PARTNERS, LTD., et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. [17-cv-04519-BLF](#)

**ORDER GRANTING JESSE L.  
YOUNG’S MOTION TO WITHDRAW  
AS COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFFS**  
[Re: ECF 55]

Before the Court is Jesse L. Young’s (“Young”) motion to withdraw as counsel of record in this matter for Plaintiffs pursuant to Civil Local Rule 11-5. *See* ECF 55 (“Mot.”). The time to oppose the motion has passed and no party has filed an opposition. For the reasons that follow, Young’s Motion to Withdraw as Counsel for Plaintiffs is GRANTED.

The decision to grant or deny an attorney’s motion to withdraw as counsel is committed to the sound discretion of the trial court. *j2 Glob. Commc'ns, Inc. v. Blue Jay, Inc.*, No. C 08-4254PJH, 2009 WL 464768, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 24, 2009) (citing *LaGrand v. Stewart*, 133 F.3d 1253, 1269 (9th Cir.)). In this district, the California Rules of Professional Conduct govern withdrawal of counsel. *See Nehad v. Mukasey*, 535 F.3d 962, 970 (9th Cir. 2008); *j2 Glob. Commc'ns, Inc. v. Blue Jay, Inc.*, No. C 08-4254PJH, 2009 WL 464768, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 24, 2009). Moreover, under Civil Local Rule 11-5, “[c]ounsel may not withdraw from an action unless relieved by order of Court after written notice has been given reasonably in advance to the client and to all other parties who have appeared in the case.” Where “withdrawal of an attorney is not accompanied by simultaneous appearance of substitute counsel or agreement of the party to appear pro se, leave to withdraw may be subject to the condition that papers may continue to be served on counsel for forwarding purposes.” Civ. L.R. 11-5(b).

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

Here, Plaintiffs will continue to be represented in this action by Jahan C. Sagafi of Outten & Golden LLP, as well as Kevin J. Stoops of Sommers Schwartz, P.C. *See* Mot. ¶ 2. Mr. Young further represents that his withdrawal will not prejudice any party and will not delay the prosecution of this matter. *Id.* ¶ 3. Given that Plaintiffs continue to be represented by counsel, and that there is no opposition to the motion, the Court concludes that withdrawal will not prejudice the parties or unduly delay resolution of this matter.

Accordingly, Jesse L. Young’s motion to withdraw as counsel for Plaintiffs is GRANTED.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: February 13, 2018

  
BETH LABSON FREEMAN  
United States District Judge