

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

Civil No. 15-2744 (JRT/DTS)

4BRAVA, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

DANIEL SACHS, DSC PRODUCTS, INC., and
DSC PRODUCTS HOLDING, LLC,

Defendants.

Civil No. 15-2743 (JRT/DTS)

LEDUC GIFTS & SPECIALTY PRODUCTS,
LLC, *d/b/a* Signature USA,

Plaintiff,

v.

DANIEL SACHS, DSC PRODUCTS, INC., DSC
PRODUCTS HOLDING, LLC,

Defendants.

ORDER

DSC PRODUCTS, INC.,

Counter Claimant,

v.

LEDUC GIFTS & SPECIALTY PRODUCTS,
LLC, *d/b/a* Signature USA,

Counter Defendant.

DSC PRODUCTS, INC.,

Cross Claimant/Third Party Plaintiff,

v.

BRUCE LEDUC, JENNEA LEDUC, MARCI
LEDUC, and 4BRAVA, LLC,

Cross Defendants/Third Party Defendants.

William R. Skolnick, Andrew H. Bardwell, and Samuel M. Johnson, **SKOLNICK & JOYCE, P.A.**, 527 Marquette Avenue South, 2100 Rand Tower, Minneapolis, MN 55402, for Daniel Sachs, DSC Products, Inc., and DSC Products Holding, LLC.

These two related cases involve an abandoned business venture that sought to sell tumblers to large retailers. On one side of the deal were Daniel Sachs and his companies DSC Products, Inc. (“DSC Products”) and DSC Products Holding, LLC (collectively, “Defendants”). These cases are set for trial early this year.

The law firm of Skolnick & Joyce, P.A., and attorneys William R. Skolnick, Andrew H. Bardwell, and Samuel M. Johnson (collectively “Counsel”) are Defendants’ current counsel of record. Counsel filed a Motion to Withdraw as Counsel of Record Without Substitution, citing “professional and ethical considerations.” (Case No. 15-2743, Mot. to Withdraw, Nov. 17, 2017, Docket No. 303; Case No. 15-2744, Mot. to Withdraw, Nov. 17, 2017, Docket No. 331.) United States Magistrate Judge David T. Schultz denied Counsel’s motion. (Case No. 15-2743, Order, Dec. 27, 2017, Docket No. 314; Case No. 15-2744, Order, Dec. 27, 2017, Docket No. 343.) Counsel filed an Expedited Objection to the Magistrate Judge’s Order. (Case No. 15-2743, Obj., Dec. 29, 2017, Docket No. 316; Case No. 15-2744, Obj., Dec. 29, 2017, Docket No. 345.)

A district court’s review of a magistrate judge’s order on nondispositive matters is “extremely deferential.” *See Roble v. Celestica Corp.*, 627 F. Supp. 2d 1008, 1014 (D. Minn. 2007). The Court will reverse such an order only if it is clearly erroneous or contrary to law. *See* D. Minn. LR 72.2(a); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A). Here, the Magistrate Judge’s Order is not clearly erroneous or contrary to law. Therefore, based on

the foregoing, and all the files, records, and proceedings herein, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Counsel's Expedited Objection to the December 27, 2017 Order Denying the Motions to Withdraw [Case No. 15-2743, Docket No. 316; Case No. 15-2744, Docket No. 345] is **OVERRULED**.

DATED: January 17, 2018
at Minneapolis, Minnesota.

s/John R. Tunheim
JOHN R. TUNHEIM
Chief Judge
United States District Court