

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
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

LUIS CARDENAS-ORNELAS,

v.
RENEE BAKER, et al.,

Petitioner,

Respondents.

Case No. 3:17-cv-00461-MMD-CBC

ORDER

On March 6, 2019, the Court ordered Petitioner’s counsel, David Neidert, to respond to Petitioner’s allegations regarding his representation of Petitioner.¹ Counsel has done so (ECF No. 32). Following review of Petitioner’s letters (ECF Nos. 25, 27, 31), and counsel’s response, the Court is not persuaded that withdrawal of counsel is justified. Counsel has met with Petitioner and filed a second amended petition on his behalf, and counsel has provided the second amended petition to Petitioner. Counsel indicates that he will provide all other past and future filings to Petitioner, and that his office is equipped to accept inmate phone calls. Counsel asserts, and the Court has no basis to disagree, that while the petition awaits a response from Respondents, there is little else to do in Petitioner’s case. There is no other indication that a conflict exists between counsel and Petitioner or that counsel is unable to adequately represent Petitioner. Accordingly, to the extent Petitioner seeks withdrawal of counsel, the motion is denied without prejudice.

DATED THIS 5th day of April 2018.



MIRANDA M. DU
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹Since the Court’s order, Petitioner has sent another letter to the Court regarding the matter, to which Mr. Neidert has also responded.