

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
TENNESSEE

Task Force BPO, LLC v. Ava Consulting, LLC and Remko
Bloemhard

Task Force BPO · No. 3:24-CV-53-TAV-JEM · Decided November 24, 2025

SUMMARY

The court grants defense counsel’s motion to withdraw because the defendants allegedly failed to communicate, participate meaningfully in the defense, and pay legal fees. Ava Consulting, LLC is ordered to obtain substitute counsel by December 12, 2025, while Remko Bloemhard is deemed to be proceeding pro se unless he obtains new counsel. The court warns that Ava Consulting’s failure to retain counsel could result in default and default judgment.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jill E. McCook
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee
DECIDED	November 24, 2025
DOCKET	3:24-CV-53-TAV-JEM
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court considered defense counsel's motion to withdraw as counsel of record for Ava Consulting, LLC and Remko Bloemhard.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied E.D. Tenn. L.R. 83.4(g) governing attorney withdrawal and the local rule requiring an artificial legal entity to proceed through counsel absent extraordinary circumstances.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished, nonprecedential memorandum and order

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- default
- commercial litigation
- corporate law

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- commercial litigation
- corporate law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether defense counsel satisfied the requirements of E.D. Tenn. L.R. 83.4(g) for withdrawal.
2. Whether extraordinary circumstances permitted counsel to withdraw before Ava Consulting, LLC obtained substitute counsel.
3. What obligations and consequences applied to Ava Consulting, LLC and Remko Bloemhard after counsel's withdrawal.

HOLDINGS

1. Counsel satisfied the requirements of E.D. Tenn. L.R. 83.4(g), including filing a motion, providing Defendants' contact information, and serving the motion on Defendants.
2. Extraordinary circumstances permitted counsel to withdraw even though Ava Consulting, LLC had not yet obtained substitute counsel.
3. The court granted the motion to withdraw and relieved David P. Pierce and Coolidge Wall Co., LPA of their duties in the case.
4. Ava Consulting, LLC may not appear in federal court without licensed counsel and was ordered to retain counsel by December 12, 2025.
5. Bloemhard was deemed to be proceeding pro se and was responsible for monitoring the case, complying with court deadlines, and responding to requests for relief if he elected to proceed without counsel.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Court therefore GRANTS the motion [Doc. 27].” (at 2)

“corporations cannot appear in federal court except through a licensed attorney.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Attorney David P. Pierce and Coolidge Wall Co., LPA represented Ava Consulting, LLC and Remko Bloemhard. Counsel stated that Defendants had refused to cooperate in the defense, failed to communicate or participate meaningfully, and failed to pay for legal services despite multiple demands. Counsel served the withdrawal motion on Defendants and included their current address and telephone number.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Defendants' counsel moved to withdraw, asserting that Defendants had failed to communicate, participate meaningfully in the defense, and pay legal fees. Counsel represented that Defendants had been served with the motion and supplied their address and telephone number. The court granted the motion, directed Ava Consulting to obtain substitute counsel by December 12, 2025, deemed Bloemhard to be proceeding pro se unless he obtained substitute counsel, and directed the Clerk's Office to mail the order to Defendants.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- In re Classicstar Mare Lease Litigation, No. 5:07-cv-353, 2009 WL 1468594, at *1 (E.D. Ky. May 13, 2009)
- Doherty v. Am. Motors Corp., 728 F.2d 334, 340 (6th Cir.)
- Peterson v. Sunderman, No. 10-114, 2010 WL 11520493, at *1 (E.D. Ky. Oct. 6, 2010)
- GCIU-Employer Ret. Fund v. Amerigraph, LLC, No. 2:06-CV-1072, 2008 WL 762082, at *1 (S.D. Ohio Mar. 20, 2008)

OPINION

Task Force BPO, LLC v. Ava Consulting, LLC and Remko Bloemhard

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

AT KNOXVILLE

TASK FORCE BPO, LLC,)

) Plaintiff,)) v.) No. 3:24-CV-53-TAV-JEM) AVA CONSULTING, LLC, and)

REMKO BLOEMHARD,)

) Defendants.)

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This case is before the undersigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, the Rules of this Court, and Standing Order 13-02. Now before the Court is the Motion of David P. Pierce, Esq. and Coolidge Wall Co., LPA to Withdraw as Counsel of Record for Defendants Ava Consulting, LLC and Remko Bloemhard [Doc. 27], filed by Defendants' attorney, David D. Pierce with the law firm of Coolidge Wall Co., LPA ("Coolidge Wall"). Attorney Pierce seeks to withdraw from representing Defendants because "[they] have refused to cooperate in the defense or pay Coolidge Wall for legal services rendered in connection with this action" [Id. at 1]. He asserts that "Defendants have failed to communicate with counsel or participate in a meaningful way in their defense" [Id. at 2]. He further submits that Defendants "have failed to pay their lawyers for services rendered in this matter despite multiple demands for the same" [Id.]. Attorney Pierce represents that he served a copy of his motion on Defendants on November 4, 2025 [Id. at 3; see also Doc. 27-1]. The motion includes Defendants' address and telephone number [Doc. 27 p. 3]. Pursuant to Local Rule 83.4, in order to withdraw from a case, an attorney must do the following:

(1) File a motion with the Court requesting permission to withdraw as counsel of record;

(2) Include in the motion the current mailing address and telephone number of the client;

(3) Unless the motion is signed by both the attorney and the client

or a consent to the withdrawal signed by the client is attached to the motion, provide a copy of the motion to the client at least 14 days prior to the date the motion is filed;

(4) If a hearing date on the motion is set, certify in writing to the

Court that the client was served at least 7 days before the hearing with notice (i) of the date, time, and place of hearing and (ii) that the client has a right to appear and be heard on the motion; and

(5) Certify to the Court that the above requirements have been met.

E.D. Tenn. L.R. 83.4(g). Attorney Pierce has met these requirements. The Local Rules also provide, “If the client is a corporation or other artificial person or legal entity created by statute that may only appear in court through counsel, the Court, absent extraordinary circumstances, shall not allow the attorney to withdraw until the client has obtained substitute counsel.” *Id.* Here, the Court finds extraordinary circumstances permit Attorney Pierce’s withdrawal. He explains that he has made multiple attempts to demand payment from Defendants to no avail. He further states that Defendants have failed to communicate with counsel or participate in a meaningful way in their defense. The Court therefore GRANTS the motion [Doc. 27]. The Court expects Attorney Pierce to provide copies of any relevant documents to any future counsel for Defendants or directly to Defendants upon request. Otherwise, Attorney Pierce and Coolidge Wall are RELIEVED of their duties in this case. 2 The Court ADMONISHES Defendant Ava Consulting, LLC (“Defendant Ava Consulting”) that corporations cannot appear in federal court except through a licensed attorney. See *In re Classicstar Mare Lease Litigation*, No. 5:07-cv-353, 2009 WL 1468594, at *1 (E.D. Ky. May 13, 2009) (“It is well settled that corporations, partnerships, and associations cannot appear in federal court except through a licensed attorney.” (citations omitted)). The Court therefore ORDERS Defendant Ava Consulting to retain counsel on or before December 12, 2025. See *Doherty v. Am. Motors Corp.*, 728 F.2d 334, 340 (6th Cir. 1984) (“The rule of this circuit is that a corporation cannot appear in federal court except through an attorney.”). The potential consequence of not securing replacement counsel for Defendant Ava Consulting is that the Court could enter default and a default judgment against the corporation. See *Peterson v. Sunderman*, No. 10-114, 2010 WL 11520493, at *1 (E.D. Ky. Oct. 6, 2010) (“When a corporation is unrepresented by counsel, an opposing party may seek the entry of default under Rule 55(a), ultimately followed by the entry of default judgment under Rule 55(b)”); *GCIU-Employer Ret. Fund v. Amerigraph, LLC*, No. 2:06-CV-1072, 2008 WL 762082, at *1 (S.D. Ohio Mar. 20, 2008) (granting the plaintiff’s motion for default judgment against a corporate defendant after the defendant’s counsel withdrew and the defendant failed to obtain substitute counsel). With respect to Defendant Bloemhard, the Court ADMONISHES him that he is DEEMED to be proceeding pro se. Until he obtains substitute counsel, it is his obligation to stay up to date on the status of this case and comply with the deadlines set by the Court. Likewise, if he elects to proceed in this case without an attorney, he is responsible for complying with all deadlines set by the Court and responding to any requests for relief by other parties, see E.D. Tenn. L.R. 7.1. Plaintiff, like any other party, will be expected to comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Local Rules, and the Court’s orders. 3 The Court DIRECTS the Clerk’s Office to mail a copy of this

Memorandum and Order to Defendants at the address provided in the motion and to update ECF accordingly. IT IS SO ORDERED. ☐☐ McCook tee — United States Magistrate Judge

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-tennessee-united-states-district-court-for/2025/task-force-bpo-llc-v-ava-consulting-llc-and-remko-bloemhard-2vcbo6rs>