

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

HUAIZHAO LIU, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

V.

Civil Action No. 19-cv-03344-KBJ

JINGSHENG WEI

Defendant.

**SUPPLEMENT TO RESPONSE
IN OPPOSITION TO COUNSEL'S MOTION TO WITHDRAW**

有關律師請辭動議的補充材料

Plaintiffs Huaizhao Liu and Charlotte Zhang ("Plaintiffs") timely responded in opposition to their counsel Ms. Nicole Wilt ("Counsel")'s Motion to Withdraw (DKT #20), which is currently pending before the Court. In light of occurrences that happened after Plaintiffs' Response ("Response", DKT #22), Plaintiffs hereby respectfully file this Supplement to Response, in an effort to move towards constructively solving the matter, and state as follows: 原告劉懷昭和夏洛特（以下簡稱 "原告"）及時回應了其律師 Nicole Wilt 女士（以下簡稱 "律師"）的請辭動議（法院卷宗 #20），該動議目前正在法院待決。鑑於在原告回應（以下簡稱 "回應"，詳見 DKT # 22）之後發生的事件，原告特此恭敬地提交補充文件，以期努力爭取建設性地解決該事項，並陳述如下。

As demonstrated in Response, Plaintiffs' opposition to Counsel's Motion to Withdraw is primarily in self-defense, pointing out the fact that it is not an "unopposed" motion as Counsel self-claims and was filed without Plaintiffs' consent. However, after Plaintiffs had filed the Response, Counsel came up with a suggestion that she would return Plaintiffs' entire retainer should Plaintiffs agree to consenting to her withdrawal ("Suggestion", see EXHIBIT). The Suggestion is in accordance with paragraph 8 of Plaintiffs' Response¹, though it would have been better had the consent been made before Counsel filing her highly problematic Motion to Withdraw which contains false claims² and prejudices the Plaintiffs. 正如在先前的回應中所表述的，原告當初反對律師的《請辭動議》主要是出於自衛，不得不指出律師的動議內容並非她自稱的“無異議”，而是在未經原告同意的情況下提交的。不過，在原告向法院提交回應後，律師提出了一個建議（以下簡稱“建議”，見附件 EXHIBIT），即如果原告同意其請辭，她將返還全部聘金。該建議符合原告人提交的回應中第 8 段（見注釋一）的內容，雖說已無法挽回律師在其請辭動議中做出的虛假陳述（見注釋二）和對原告不利的影響，但總算亡羊補牢。

Counsel's Suggestion, as in the Exhibit, came up as a reply to Plaintiffs' inquiry as to why Counsel advised Plaintiffs to request an extension for the deadline for Answer to Counterclaim. The email, dated October 8, 2020, came 4 days before the deadline for Answer to Counterclaim, and it

¹ “8. Though Plaintiffs neither wished nor were they prepared to lose Counsel in face of approaching Court schedule and deadlines, Plaintiffs did concede to allow Counsel to withdraw providing that the retainer fee would be returned in full when she withdraws. This is in consideration of the situation that a) Counsel hasn't yet engaged in any work regarding the case; b) the retainer fee was so hard-raised by Plaintiffs that without getting it back Plaintiffs would not be able to retain a replacement counsel.” 原告提交的回應中第 8 段內容是：“雖然原告既不希望也毫無準備在臨近法院的排期時失去律師，但原告確實曾表示可以允許律師退出，前提條件是在她退出時全額退還聘金。這是考慮到：a)律師迄今尚未從事任何與案件有關的代理工作；b)聘金是原告辛辛苦苦籌集的，如果不拿回聘金，原告就無法聘請替代律師。”

² See, for example, described in paragraph 12 of Plaintiffs' Response. 例如，見原告的回應中第 12 段所述內容。

indicates that Counsel is still not prepared to work on the case. Further, it indicates that Counsel is not suggesting an extension for her to work on the case but simply a delaying tactic, as she reiterates that her continued representation has become impossible. In realizing the situation, Plaintiffs were forced to act pro se and to start working on the Answer to Counterclaim by themselves within the four days before the alerted deadline, without time to immediately address the issue of Counsel's withdrawal that Counsel raised again in this email. 律師此建議如附件所示，它出現在律師回覆原告的一個電郵中（該電郵是回覆原告的詢問：為何律師建議原告申請拖延回應反訴狀）。該郵件的日期為 2020 年 10 月 8 日，是在法庭規定原告對反訴狀進行答辯的最後期限前 4 天發出的，而該郵件表明，律師仍未準備好代理本案。此外，該郵件還表明，律師建議拖延答辯，並不是為了爭取更多時間供她準備答辯，而純粹是為了拖著不辦，因為她在郵件中重申，“繼續代理已經不可能了”。原告在意識到這一狀況後，不得不採取自訴的方式，在離遞交期限僅剩前四天的情況下開始自行撰寫《對反訴狀的答辯書》，而沒有時間先去立即解決律師在這封郵件中再次提出的律師請辭問題。

Conclusion:

結論

Though Plaintiffs have no knowledge about how to handle an aftermath of Counsel's undue withdrawal prejudice, and are anticipating a difficult situation to obtain a new lawyer, they nevertheless remain willing to consent to Counsel's withdraw, providing she returns the entire retainer fee to make it possible for Plaintiffs to look for a new counsel, as explained in Plaintiffs' Response, especially now that Counsel reiterates that her continued representation has become impossible. 雖然原告不知將如何面對律師不當請

辭造成的爛攤子，而且預計很難找到新的律師，但一如原告在回應中所解釋的那樣，原告仍情願同意律師辭職，條件是她退還全部聘金，起碼使原告尋找替代律師成為可能，特別是律師重申她已經不可能繼續代理的情況下。

Respectfully submitted,

Dated this 8th day of November, 2020.

Plaintiffs

Huaizhao Liu

6218 Georgia Ave. NW #5018

Washington, DC 20011

heather01.liu@gmail.com

(202)660-3235

Charlotte Zhang

6218 Georgia Ave. NW #5018

Washington, DC 20011

charlottec322556@gmail.com

(202)660-3235

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 8th day of November, 2020, I filed the Supplement to Response in Opposition to Counsel's Motion to Withdraw in person at this Honorable Court's drop box, and caused a true copy of the forgoing document to be served by email to:

Nicole Wilt
1629 K Street NW Suite 300
Washington, DC 20006
202-508-3648
nicolewilt@dclawyerfirm.com
Counsel for Plaintiffs

David Barger
Greenberg Traurig LLP
1750 Tyson Blvd.
Suite 1200
McLean, VA 22102
703-749-1300
bargerd@gtlaw.com
Counsel for Defendant

Huaizhao Liu
6218 Georgia Ave. NW
#5018
Washington, DC 20011
heather01.liu@gmail.com
(202)660-3235
Plaintiff

