

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	*	
Plaintiff,	*	
v.	*	Civil Action No. 8:17-cv-00444-PX
ROGER R. BLUNT,	*	
Defendant.	*	
	***	

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER**

Pending before the Court is a motion to withdraw as attorney by counsel for Defendant Roger Blunt. ECF No. 54. Whether to allow withdrawal is committed to the discretion of the Court. *Abbott v. Gordon*, No. DKC-09-0372, 2010 WL 4183334, at \*1 (D. Md. Oct. 25, 2010). The Court must consider the potential prejudice to the parties and the potential disruption to the administration of justice. *Al-Sabah v. Agbodjogbe*, No. ELH-17-730, 2019 WL 1472585, at \*3 (D. Md. Apr. 3, 2019). Where, as here, the Court must resolve a pending dispositive motion for summary judgment about which current counsel is knowledgeable, withdrawal would be “quite disruptive.” See *Patterson v. Gemini Org., Ltd.*, 238 F.3d 414 (Table), 2000 WL 1718542, at \*2 (4th Cir. 2000).

Further, the Court recently held a recorded status conference with the parties concerning discovery and scheduling. ECF No. 52. At that conference, the Court conveyed its expectation that dispositive motions would be addressed in short order. Blunt’s counsel never raised the possibility of withdrawal. Given that this case has been pending for over two years, delayed considerably at Blunt’s request, the prejudice that would inure to the Government by withdrawal at this late stage compels the Court to deny this motion.

Accordingly, it is this 14th day of June 2019, by the United States District Court for the

District of Maryland, ORDERED that the Motion to Withdraw as Attorney (ECF No. 54) filed by Defendant Roger Blunt BE, and the same hereby IS, DENIED without prejudice to refile after resolution of the pending motion for summary judgment, if appropriate.

6/14/2019  
Date

---

/S/  
Paula Xinis  
United States District Judge

---