

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Thomas Robert Ferguson, III v. Jagjit Singh Rai, et al.

Ferguson v. Rai · No. 2:23-cv-00737-CDS-MDC · Decided January 21, 2026

OPINION

Rai

PER CURIAM.

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 Thomas Robert Ferguson, III, Case No. 2:23-cv-00737-CDS-MDC 4 Plaintiff,

ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO

5 vs. REMOVE ATTORNEY (ECF NO. 57) AND

DIRECTING REMAINING COUNSEL TO

6 Jagjit Singh Rai, et al.,

UPDATE RECORDS

7 Defendants. 8 Plaintiff filed a Motion to Remove Attorney (ECF No. 57) (“Motion”). Plaintiff
through his

9 counsel requests to remove Amber N. King, Esq. and Ryan Kerbow, Esq as counsel of record in
this 10 matter. ECF No. 57. Plaintiff states that Ms. King and Mr. Kerbow are no longer employed
by the law 11 office representing plaintiff and that Scott L. Poisson, Esq. and Daniel J. Tafoya, Jr.,
Esq. will continue 12 to represent plaintiff. See ECF Nos. 55, 57. For good cause shown and
because the Motion is not 13 opposed, the Court GRANTS the Motion. 14 The Court further
instructs plaintiff’s counsel to update their contact information on CM/ECF. 15 The current
contact information for both Mr. Poisson and Mr. Tafoya lists that they are affiliated with 16
Bernstein & Poisson. However, the Motion states both counsel are now affiliated with High Stakes
17 Injury Law. ECF No. 57. 18 // 19 // 20 // 21 // 22 // 23 // 24 // 25 1

1 ACCORDINGLY,

2 IT IS ORDERED that: 3 1. The Motion to Remove Attorney (ECF No. 57) is GRANTED. 4 2.
Amber N. King, Esq. and Ryan Kerbow, Esq. are to be removed as counsel of record for 5
plaintiff in this matter. 6 3. The Clerk of Court is kindly instructed to please remove Amber N.
King, Esq. and Ryan 7 Kerbow, Esq. from CM/ECF Service in this matter 8 4. Scott L. Poisson,
Esq. and Daniel J. Tafoya, Jr., Esq. shall update their CM/ECF Service 9 contact information by
February 4, 2026. 10 DATED: January 21, 2026.

M IT IS SO ORDERED. L7 a

uf gMagiptrate Judge 14 [/

15 NOTICE

16 Pursuant to Local Rules IB 3-1 and IB 3-2, a party may object to orders and reports and 17 || recommendations issued by the magistrate judge. Objections must be in writing and filed with the Clerk 1g || of the Court within fourteen days. LR IB 3-1, 3-2. The Supreme Court has held that the courts of appeal 19 || may determine that an appeal has been waived due to the failure to file objections within the specified 29 || time. *Thomas vy. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 142 (1985). This circuit has also held that (1) failure to file objections within the specified time and (2) 27 || failure to properly address and brief the objectionable issues waives the right to appeal the District 23 || Court's order and/or appeal factual issues from the order of the District Court. *Martinez v. Yist*, 951 F.2d 24] 1153, 1157 (Oth Cir. 1991); *Britt v. Simi Valley United Sch. Dist.*, 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983). 25 || Pursuant to LR JA 3-1, the plaintiff must immediately file written notification with the court of any 1 change of address. The notification must include proof of service upon each opposing party's attorney, 2 or upon the opposing party if the party is unrepresented by counsel. Failure to comply with this rule may 3 result in dismissal of the action.

4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 3