1 HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 8 AT SEATTLE 9 10 AR PILLOW INC., et al., CASE NO. C11-1962 RAJ 11 Plaintiffs, 12 v. ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO WITHDRAW AND MOTION 13 ANNETTE COTTRELL, FOR EXTENSION OF TIME 14 Defendant. 15 16 This matter comes before the court on counsel for plaintiffs AR Pillow, Inc.'s and 17 Elizabeth Goutevenier's motion to withdraw as counsel and motion for extension of time. 18 Dkt. # 64. Ms. Goutevenier and new counsel for plaintiffs (who have not yet appeared) 19 have also filed letters requesting an extension of time to respond to defendants' Rule 37 20 motion. Dkt. # 67, # 69. New counsel also requests additional time to respond to 21 defendants' motion for attorney's fees, to file a reply in support of plaintiffs' motion for 22 attorney's fees, and to file a motion for summary judgment. Dkt. #69. 23 With respect to the motion to withdraw as counsel, defendants object to allowing 24 withdrawal because plaintiffs do not meet "GR2 (g)" requirements. This District revised 25 the local rules on December 1, 2012, and the "General Rules" are no longer in force. 26 Rather, Local Civil Rule ("LCR") 83.1(b) governs withdrawal. Although counsel for 27

plaintiffs, Eric Helmy, cites to his declaration, no declaration was filed in connection with the motion to withdraw. Nevertheless, Mr. Helmy represents that plaintiffs directed Mr. Helmy and his firm to withdraw as counsel. Additionally, plaintiffs have filed a letter requesting an extension of time in which Ms. Goutevenier refers to the motion filed by Mr. Helmy, emphasizes the "irreconcilable conflict" and explains that she "did not fully come to understand the implications of the conflict of interest between [herself] and Mr. Helmy until this past weekend." Dkt. # 67. Given that plaintiffs directed Mr. Helmy to withdraw, Ms. Goutevenier herself has requested withdrawal, and she specifically refers to the motion filed, the court finds that she had notice of the motion, and withdrawal of counsel is appropriate. For all the foregoing reasons, the court GRANTS Mr. Helmy's motion to withdraw as counsel, and Mr. Helmy and his firm are DISCHARGED as counsel for plaintiffs. Mr. Helmy is DIRECTED to make the transition to new counsel as easy as possible by, among other things, transferring files, records, etc. in an expeditious manner.

With respect to the motion for extension of time, the court finds good cause to grant the extension given the timing of the court's order granting defendant's special motion to strike (December 4), Ms. Goutevenier's apparent discovery of the irreconcilable conflict with her attorney (weekend prior to December 11), the date her response to the Rule 37 motion was due (December 10), and new counsel's apparent engagement (within a few days of December 19). For all the foregoing reasons, the court GRANTS plaintiffs' motion for extension of time as follows:

- 1. Given the court's heavy docket and trial schedule, the court will set trial for August 19, 2013.
 - 2. New counsel shall enter an appearance no later than January 15, 2013.
- 3. Plaintiffs' response to defendants' Rule 37 motion is due January 28, 2013. Defendants' reply is due February 1, 2013. The Clerk is DIRECTED to renote defendants' Rule 37 motion for February 1, 2013. Dkt. # 54.

4. Plaintiffs may file their reply in support of their motion to compel no later
than January 28, 2013. Defendants may respond to plaintiffs' reply, and will
specifically reference this order if they choose to do so no later than February 1, 2013.
The Clerk is DIRECTED to renote the motion to compel for February 1, 2013. Dkt. #
56.
5. Plaintiffs may respond to defendants' motion for attorney's fees no later
than January 28, 2013. Defendants may reply no later than February 1, 2013. The Clerk
is DIRECTED to renote defendants' motion for attorney's fees for February 1, 2013.
Dkt. # 65.
6. The new deadline for dispositive motions shall be May 30, 2013. The
Clerk is DIRECTED to TERMINATE defendants' motion for summary judgment. Dkt.
68. Defendants may refile the motion for summary judgment consistent with this
order.
7. The Clerk is DIRECTED to TERMINATE the motions for extension of
time. Dkt. # 64, # 67.
8. The Clerk is DIRECTED to enter an amended case schedule consistent
with this order.
Dated this 27 th day of December, 2012.
Richard A Jane
The Honorable Richard A. Jones
United States District Judge