1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
8	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE	
9	•	
10	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	CASE NO. C17-1284JLR
11	Plaintiff,	ORDER STRIKING PRO SE RESPONSE
12	V.	TEEST OF USE
13	JOHN YIN,	
14	Defendant.	
15	T. ROWE PRICE,	·
16	Garnishee.	
17	This is a case where the United States of America seeks a continuing garnishment	
18	order as to T. Rowe Price, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 3205. (See Mot. (Dkt. #7) at 1.)	
19	Defendant John Yin filed pro se a response to this motion (see Resp. (Dkt. # 14)), even	
20	though he is represented by counsel Kirk Davis (Not. of Appearance (Dkt. # 10) at 1). A	
21	person who is represented by counsel cannot file pro se motions. See United States v.	

Gallardo, 915 F. Supp. 216, 218 n.1 (D. Nev. 1995); see also Le v. Almager, No.

C 08-03293 SBA, 2013 WL 415632, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 31, 2013) ("A court need not consider pro se motions filed by a party who remains represented by counsel."). Thus, the court STRIKES Mr. Yin's pro se response to the United States' motion. Mr. Davis indicated to the United States that he is no longer representing Mr. Yin. (See Mot. for Extension (Dkt. # 15) \P 7.) To the extent that Mr. Davis wishes to withdraw as attorney for Mr. Yin, he must follow the procedures as outlined in Local Rule 83.2(b). See Local Rules W.D. Wash. LCR 83.2(b). Until Mr. Davis does so, he remains counsel for Mr. Yin. See id. ("No attorney shall withdraw an appearance in any case . . . except by leave of court ") Dated this 30 day of September, 2017. JAMES L. ROBART United States District Judge