

Here is the "portion of the Email exchange" referenced on Page 7 of this Motion.  
(Email exchange between Mr. Brackett, the Court, and Rikard on February 16, 2016)

**Doskocil et al. v. Culp et al 2001-CP-40-229**

2 messages

**Mike Brackett** <MBrackett@mkb-law.com> Thu, Feb 16, 2012 at **12:21 PM**  
To: "stricklandj@rcgov.us" <stricklandj@rcgov.us>  
Cc: <kdoskocil@gmail.com>, "rgr@rplegalgroup.com" <rgr@rplegalgroup.com>

Judge Strickland,

Attached is the revised Order per your instructions.

Mike Brackett

B. Michael "Mike" Brackett  
Moses Koon & Brackett, PC



**Order rev. 2.16.12 granting motion.pdf**

21K

**Robert Rikard** <rgr@rplegalgroup.com> Thu, Feb 16, 2012 at **12:34 PM**  
To: Mike Brackett <MBrackett@mkb-law.com>, "stricklandj@rcgov.us" <stricklandj@rcgov.us>  
Cc: <kdoskocil@gmail.com>

The only suggested change that I would have is as follows:

“There has been almost ten years of litigation including a settlement that the parties argued to be set aside. Ms. Culp objected to this motion.”

RGR  
Robert G. Rikard  
Rikard & Protopapas LLC

RECEIVED  
FILED

2012 FEB 16 PM 2:50

JEAN...  
C.C.P. & ...

2002-CP-40-0229

Order Granting B. Michael Brackett's  
Motion to be Relieved as Counsel and  
Order of Dismissal



STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA	)	
	)	IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
COUNTY OF RICHLAND	)	
	)	2002-CP-40- 0229
	)	
Karl A. Daskocil and John M. Daskocil,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	Order Granting B. Michael Brackett's
vs.	)	Motion to be Relieved as Counsel and
	)	Order of Dismissal
Patricia Gail D. Culp, Trustee of Karl V.	)	
Daskocil Trust U/A/D December 14,	)	
1995,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

Attorney B. Michael Brackett's Motion to be Relieved as Counsel for Plaintiff Karl A. Daskocil was heard on October 20, 2011 at 3:30 PM. The Court noted that its file reflects that timely notice of the hearing had been served on the parties and attorneys of record. In attendance were attorney Brackett, Karl Daskocil and attorney Robert Rikard, representing the Defendant Trustee.

Mr. Brackett's Motion is supported by his Affidavit that was filed and served with the Motion. Karl Daskocil made oral objection to the relief sought by the motion.

Based upon the showing made, the Court finds that the written attorney employment agreement provides that Mr. Brackett and his firm can withdraw as attorney for the client if the bills are not timely paid and if the relationship between attorney and client becomes unworkable. Brackett's affidavit demonstrates that there has been a breakdown of the attorney-client relationship, attorney fee bills have not been paid resulting in a significant balance owing to Brackett. Karl Daskocil claimed that he would be prejudiced if forced to retain new counsel, but the Court gave Mr. Daskocil ample time to retain new counsel. Accordingly, it is

ORDERED, that Mr. Brackett's Motion to be Relieved as Attorney in this matter be, and it hereby is, granted. Mr. Brackett has no further duties or responsibilities owing to Karl A. Daskocil. Mr. Daskocil had until February 1, 2012 to retain new counsel and to have the new attorney enter a notice of appearance, pursuant to my oral Order.

Finally, the Plaintiffs have failed to prosecute this matter to a conclusion on the merits. There has been almost ten years of litigation including a settlement that the parties argued to be set aside. Pursuant to Rule 41, SCRPC, this case is dismissed without prejudice for lack of prosecution.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

February , 2012

---

Joseph M. Strickland,  
Richland County Master-in-Equity