

NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION

To be cited only in accordance with
Fed. R. App. P. 32.1

United States Court of Appeals

**For the Seventh Circuit
Chicago, Illinois 60604**

Submitted April 14, 2010*
Decided April 14, 2010

Before

WILLIAM J. BAUER, *Circuit Judge*

RICHARD A. POSNER, *Circuit Judge*

TERENCE T. EVANS, *Circuit Judge*

No. 09-3519

P.H. INTERNATIONAL TRADING
COMPANY, d/b/a HANA K.
FASHIONS
Plaintiff-Appellant,

Appeal from the United States District
Court for the Northern District of Illinois,
Eastern Division.

v.

No. 04 C 903

CHRISTIA CONFEZIONI S.p.A., et al.
Defendants-Appellees.

David H. Coar,
Judge.

ORDER

P.H. International Trading Company, doing business as Hana K. Fashions (“Hana K.”), is a New York corporation. Hana K., a coat boutique in the Chicago area owned by Hana and Pierre Lang, was unsuccessful in its breach-of-contract suit against Christia Confezioni S.p.A. (“Christia”), an Italian manufacturer of high-end clothing. The Langs’

* The defendants are not participating in this appeal. Thus, the appeal is submitted on the appellant’s brief and the record. *See* FED. R. APP. P. 34(a)(2)(C).

subsequent pro se motion under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b) to challenge the final judgment was also unsuccessful, and they appeal. Because the Langs—as pro se litigants—may not represent Hana K. in federal court, we dismiss the appeal.

This case arose from a contract suit that Hana K. filed in 2003 against Christia; FBLGINC Corporation, a Canadian coat distributor with whom Christia entered a contract in 2002; and FBLG Incorporated, a Delaware corporation that does Internet marketing. After the district court applied Italian law and granted summary judgment for the defendants, Hana K. moved, unsuccessfully, to vacate the ruling. Hana K.'s subsequent appeal to this court was dismissed for lack of prosecution. *See* CIR. R. 31(c)(2); *P.H. Int'l Trading Co. v. Christia Confezioni S.p.A., et al.*, No. 07-3690 (7th Cir. June 17, 2008).

In September 2009, Hana and Pierre Lang, now proceeding pro se on behalf of Hana K., moved the district court under Rule 60 to vacate summary judgment based on “new” evidence of Italian law. The court treated the motion as one under Rule 60(b)(2) and denied it, finding that the evidence had been previously available and that the motion was untimely. The Langs then filed a motion to reconsider under Rule 60(b)(6), offering the same information presented in their previous Rule 60 motion; this motion was also denied.

On appeal the Langs reassert in general terms that the district court has erred throughout these proceedings by ignoring the applicable Italian law. The Langs, however, may not represent Hana K. in a legal capacity; only a lawyer may litigate in federal court on behalf of a corporation. *See United States v. Hagerman*, 545 F.3d 579, 581 (7th Cir. 2009); *Old Ben Coal Co. v. Office of Workers' Compensation Programs*, 476 F.3d 418, 418-19 (7th Cir. 2007). Accordingly, we must DISMISS this appeal.