

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION**

JENNY THORNLEY,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	Case No.: 21-cv-01922
v.)	
)	Judge Sharon Johnson Coleman
STATE OF ILLINOIS, ILLINOIS STATE)	
POLICE MERIT BOARD, and JACK S.)	
GARCIA, individually,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

**DEFENDANT GARCIA’S RESPONSE TO MR. TEPLINSKY’S
MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM ASSIGNMENT AND TO WITHDRAW**

Defendant, **JACK GARCIA**, by and through undersigned counsel, respectfully submits the following Response to Mr. Teplinsky’s Motion for Relief From Assignment and to Withdraw Appearance. (Dkt. 71).

1. On February 24, 2023, the Court held a status hearing. Plaintiff Thornely did not appear, nor did she contact the Court. (Dkt. 70). At the hearing, the Court granted Defendants’ request to lift the stay, previously entered at the Plaintiff’s request, based on the history of the case and “lack of participation from plaintiff.” (*Id.*) The Court further ordered Plaintiff to file her Answer to Defendant’s counterclaim by March 17, 2023, and set a status hearing on March 28, 2023. (*Id.*).

2. On March 6, 2023, recruited counsel for Plaintiff, Mr. Teplinsky, filed a motion for relief from his assignment and to withdraw his appearance. (Dkt. 71). In his motion, Mr. Teplinsky explained to the Court that he has been unable to communicate with Ms. Thornley for several months, and has sent at least nine unanswered emails to her since October 20, 2022. (Dkt.

71, p.2). As a result, Mr. Teplinsky explained that the attorney-client relationship with Plaintiff has become “irretrievably broken down,” such that he cannot continue the representation. (*Id.*). Mr. Teplinsky concluded his motion by moving the Court on Plaintiff’s behalf for an additional 35-days from the grant of his withdrawal for Plaintiff to either appear *pro se* or through new counsel, and further that the Court extend Plaintiff’s March 17, 2023 deadline to file her Answer. (Dkt. 71, p.3).

3. The undersigned take no issue with Mr. Teplinsky’s request to withdraw his appearance. However, the undersigned believe it would be fundamentally unfair, and unwarranted, for Plaintiff to be afforded an *additional* extension of time when she has occasioned extensive delays in this matter, only the most recent of which involves her lack of cooperation and communication with Mr. Teplinsky. While counsel understand Mr. Teplinsky’s request on Plaintiff’s behalf, it is submitted that there is simply no basis for the grant of additional time within which to answer.

4. As a result, the undersigned interpose no objection to Mr. Teplinsky’s motion to withdraw, but respectfully ask the Court to maintain the existing March 17, 2023 deadline on Plaintiff’s Answer to Defendant’s counterclaims.

Dated: March 7, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Robin V. Waters

Robin V. Waters
Jeremy D. Margolis
Loeb & Loeb LLP
321 N. Clark Street, Suite 2300
Chicago, IL 60654
Tel: (312) 464-3100
Fax: (312) 464-3111
rwaters@loeb.com
jmargolis@loeb.com

Attorneys for Jack S. Garcia, in his individual capacity