

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
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SHYRIAA HENDERSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED STUDENT AID FUNDS, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No.: 13cv1845 JLS (BLM)

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO
WITHDRAW AS COUNSEL**
(ECF No. 202)

Presently before the Court is Stroock & Stroock & Lavan (“Stroock”) LLP’s Motion to Withdraw as Counsel for Defendant Navient Solutions, Inc. (“Withdrawal Mot.”) (ECF No. 202). In support of its motion, Stroock notes that (1) Lisa M. Simonetti, Esq., who is lead counsel for Navient in this action, is no longer a member of Stroock, but instead is a member of Vedder Price; (2) Lisa M. Simonetti, Esq. continues to act as counsel for Navient; and (3) that “Navient consents to the withdrawal and is being served with this Motion through their counsel of record, Lisa M. Simonetti.” (Withdrawal Mot. 1.)

///
///
///
///
///


1 A Court reviewing a motion to withdrawal as counsel often considers:

2
3 (1) the reasons why withdrawal is sought; (2) the prejudice withdrawal may
4 cause to other litigants; (3) the harm withdrawal might cause to the
5 administration of justice; and (4) the degree to which withdrawal will delay
6 the resolution of the case.

7 *Kassab v. San Diego Police Dep't*, No. 07CV1071 WQH WMC, 2008 WL 251935,
8 at *1 (S.D. Cal. Jan. 29, 2008). In the present case, the Court is satisfied that Stroock has
9 sound reasons for seeking withdrawal, and that granting withdrawal will not prejudice other
10 defendants, cause harm to the administration of justice, or delay resolution of the case.
11 Accordingly, good cause appearing, the Court **GRANTS** Stroock's Withdrawal Motion.
12 The clerk **SHALL** update the docket to reflect the withdrawal of Stroock & Stroock &
13 Lavan.

14 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

15 Dated: November 17, 2016

16 
17 Hon. Janis L. Sammartino
18 United States District Judge
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28