

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PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished, nonprecedential memorandum and order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)

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>