

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
9 AT SEATTLE

10  
11 KA WAI JIMMY LO,

Plaintiff,

v.

12  
13 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

14 Defendant.

CASE NO. 2:17-cv-01202-TL

ORDER REGARDING MOTION TO  
WITHDRAW AS COUNSEL

15  
16  
17 This matter comes before the Court on the motion of Plaintiff's counsel Michael Reid to  
18 withdraw as counsel (the "Motion to Withdraw"). Dkt. No. 110. The Court has reviewed the  
19 Motion to Withdraw and the relevant record. As Plaintiff is represented by multiple attorneys  
20 from different firms and granting the Motion to Withdraw will not leave Plaintiff without  
21 representation, *see* Dkt. No. 110 at 2, leave of the Court is not required for Mr. Reid to withdraw  
22 from the case. *See* LCR 83.2(b)(3).

23 The Motion to Withdraw fails to fully satisfy the technical requirements of Local Civil  
24 Rule 83.2(b)(3), namely for its failure to include the signatures of Plaintiff's remaining counsel.

ORDER REGARDING MOTION TO  
WITHDRAW AS COUNSEL - 1

1 See LCR 83.2(b)(3) (“The [Notice of Withdrawal] shall be signed by the withdrawing attorney(s)  
2 and the remaining attorney(s) of record . . . .”). However, Mr. Reid represents that Plaintiff, co-  
3 counsel Anthony Marsh of Hermann Law Group, and defense counsel have consented to  
4 Mr. Reid’s withdrawal from the case. Dkt. No. 110 at 2. Co-counsel Xi Wang, who has also  
5 appeared in the case as counsel for Plaintiff, is a colleague of Mr. Marsh who has not personally  
6 consented to Mr. Reid’s withdrawal. However, lawyers of the same firm are ordinarily treated as  
7 one lawyer. See Wash. Rules of Pro. Conduct r. 1.10, cmt. 2 (noting “the premise that a firm of  
8 lawyers is essentially one lawyer” in the context of duties of client loyalty). In addition, Ms. Xi  
9 was served with the Motion to Withdraw via ECF notification, see Dkt. No. 110 at 3, and had an  
10 opportunity to object, which she has not done. Accordingly, and in light of Mr. Reid’s significant  
11 and potentially debilitating health problems, see Dkt. No. 110 at 2, the Court finds that these  
12 errors are non-prejudicial and excusable in this instance.

13 For the foregoing reasons, Mr. Reid’s motion to withdraw as counsel for Plaintiff (Dkt.  
14 No. 110) is GRANTED.

15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 Dated this 7<sup>th</sup> day of February 2022.

17   
18 \_\_\_\_\_  
19 Tana Lin  
20 United States District Judge  
21  
22  
23  
24