

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

ALLIED WORLD INSURANCE
COMPANY, a New Hampshire
corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

GLOBAL METALS CORPORATION, a
California corporation; KEITH COE, an
individual,

Defendants.

Case No.: 15-cv-0121-GPC-JMA

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO
WITHDRAW AS COUNSEL BY
PETER B. NICHOLS AND
MATTHEW STOHL**

[ECF No. 27]

On September 17, 2015, the law firm of Balestreri Potocki & Holmes and attorneys Matthew Stohl and Peter B. Nichols (collectively “Attorneys”) filed a motion for leave to withdraw as attorneys of record for Defendants Global Metal Corporation and Keith Coe (collectively “Defendants”). (ECF No. 27.) The Court instructed Attorneys to lodge with

1 the Court for *in camera* review declarations in support of their motion on or by October
2 23, 2015. (ECF No. 29.) On October 22, 2015, Peter B. Nichols and Matthew Stohl lodged
3 with the Court declarations dated October 22, 2015 and October 20, 2015, respectively.
4 No opposition has been filed. The Court finds the matter suitable for disposition without
5 a hearing pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7.1(d)(1). For the reasons set forth below, the Court
6 **GRANTS** the motion to withdraw as counsel by the law firm of Balestreri Potocki &
7 Holmes and attorneys Matthew Stohl and Peter B. Nichols.

8 **DISCUSSION**

9 In a civil case, the trial court has discretion whether to grant or deny a motion to
10 withdraw as counsel. *LaGrand v. Stewart*, 133 F.3d 1253, 1269 (9th Cir. 1998). “When
11 ruling on a motion to withdraw, courts may consider the disruptive impact that the
12 withdrawal will have on the prosecution of the case.” *Byrd v. D.C.*, 271 F. Supp. 2d 174,
13 176 (D.D.C. 2003). In addition to the efficient and fair administration of justice, courts
14 may also consider the reasons why withdrawal is sought and whether the change will
15 prejudice the client and other litigants. *E.g., Nehad v. Mukasey*, 535 F.3d 962, 968-72 (9th
16 Cir. 2008); *Whiting v. Lacara*, 187 F.3d 317, 320-23 (2d Cir. 1999); *Rusinow v. Kamara*,
17 920 F. Supp. 69, 71 (D.N.J. 1996).

18 Upon due consideration of written arguments of counsel and good cause appearing,
19 the Court **GRANTS** Attorneys’ motion to withdraw as counsel. Accordingly, **IT IS**
20 **HEREBY ORDERED** that Balestreri Potocki & Holmes and attorneys Matthew Stohl and
21 Peter B. Nichols are terminated as attorneys of record for Defendants. The Clerk of Court
22 is instructed to file under seal *in camera* declarations of Peter B. Nichols and Matthew
23 Stohl lodged with the Court dated October 22, 2015 and October 20, 2015, respectively.

24 //

