

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Amber Jackson-Boyd v. Patricia Brown, et al.

Jackson-Boyd · No. 2:25-cv-00674-DC-AC · Decided November 25, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California grants attorney Robert Ross Powell’s motion to withdraw as counsel for Plaintiff Amber Jackson-Boyd. The court finds a fundamental breakdown in the attorney-client relationship, determines that withdrawal will not cause undue prejudice or delay, and allows Plaintiff thirty days to obtain new counsel or proceed pro se. The order also directs counsel to comply with California Rule of Professional Conduct 1.16(e) and provides Plaintiff’s contact information for the court record.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Dena M. Coggins
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	November 25, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-00674-DC-AC
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court considered Plaintiff's counsel's noticed motion to withdraw as counsel of record under Local Rule 230(g).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The decision whether to grant or deny a permissive motion to withdraw is committed to the trial court's discretion.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; precedential status unknown.

TOPICS

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure legal ethics and professional responsibility

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff's counsel should be permitted to withdraw based on a breakdown in the attorney-client relationship under California Rule of Professional Conduct 1.16(b).
2. Whether the requested withdrawal would cause undue prejudice, delay, or harm to the administration of justice.

HOLDINGS

1. A district court may grant a permissive motion to withdraw when the grounds identified in California Rule of Professional Conduct 1.16(b) are established and withdrawal is appropriate after considering the reasons for withdrawal, prejudice to other litigants, harm to the administration of justice, and delay.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“For permissive withdrawals, the decision to grant or deny an attorney’s motion to withdraw is committed to the discretion of the trial court.” (at 2)

“In ruling on a motion to withdraw as counsel, courts consider: (1) the reasons why withdrawal is sought; (2) the prejudice withdrawal may cause to other litigants; (3) the harm withdrawal might cause to the administration of justice; and (4) the degree to which withdrawal will delay the resolution of the case.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff's counsel represented that months of unsuccessful communications, lengthy periods without responses, and lack of progress had caused a fundamental and irreconcilable breakdown in the attorney-client relationship. Counsel gave Plaintiff written notice of the intention to withdraw and provided her with the motion and supporting declaration before filing. The action remained at an early stage, and Defendants raised no concern about prejudice or delay.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Robert Ross Powell, Plaintiff's counsel of record, moved to withdraw based on a complete breakdown in the attorney-client relationship. Defendants did not oppose the motion. The case was in its early stages: Defendants had recently answered and no scheduling order had issued. The court granted the motion and gave Plaintiff thirty days to obtain new counsel or elect to proceed pro se.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Beard v. Shuttermart of Cal., Inc.*, No. 3:07-cv-00594-WQH-NLS, 2008 WL 410694, at *2 (S.D. Cal. Feb. 13, 2008)
- *CE Res., Inc. v. Magellan Grp., LLC*, No. 2:08-cv-02999-MCE-KJM, 2009 WL 3367489, at *2 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 14, 2009)

