

**UNPUBLISHED**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 08-1878**

---

HONOUR TECHNICAL GROUP, INC.; BRIAN K. HONOUR,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE; DEPARTMENT  
OF TREASURY; INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE; PAUL CLEMENT,  
Solicitor General,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

**No. 09-1138**

---

HONOUR TECHNICAL GROUP, INC.; BRIAN K. HONOUR,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE; DEPARTMENT  
OF TREASURY; INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE; PAUL CLEMENT,  
Solicitor General,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. James C. Dever, III,  
District Judge. (5:07-cv-00472-D)

---

Submitted: May 28, 2009

Decided: June 2, 2009

Before WILKINSON, KING, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed in part; dismissed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Brian K. Honour, Appellant Pro Se. Sara Ann Ketchum, David I. Pincus, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, DC, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Honour Technical Group, Inc., and Brian K. Honour seek to appeal the district court's orders dismissing their action without prejudice and denying their subsequent motions to expedite and to reopen the case. We dismiss the appeals as they pertain to Honour Technical Group, Inc., because it is not represented by counsel and a corporation may not proceed pro se in federal court. See Rowland v. California Men's Colony, 506 U.S. 194, 202 (1993) ("A corporation may appear in the federal courts only through licensed counsel."). We also deny the pending motions for reconsideration of this court's position that a corporation may not proceed on appeal without representation by counsel.

Turning to Honour's claims as an individual, we have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm the appeals as they pertain to Brian K. Honour for the reasons stated by the district court. Honour Tech. Group, Inc. v. United States, No. 5:07-cv-00472-D (E.D.N.C. May 27, 2008). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED IN PART;  
DISMISSED IN PART