

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS
WESTERN DIVISION**

RON DAVIS, et al.

PLAINTIFFS

v.

**4:10CV1560-BRW
4:10CV1607-BRW
4:10CV1608-BRW
4:10CV1609-BRW
4:10CV1610-BRW
4:10CV1611-BRW**

REGINA FAVORS, et al.

DEFENDANTS

ORDER

Pending are Plaintiff's Motions for Reconsideration¹ of my orders denying his motions to remand these related cases to state court. I see no reason to hold a hearing on this matter, and the Motions are hereby DENIED.

In the event that his Motions for Reconsideration are denied, Plaintiff requests a sixty-day "delay . . . [for] the filing of a pleading to address the Complaint and to substitute Council [sic] for the presentation of a more comprehensive Pleading." Although I deny his request for a sixty-day delay, Plaintiff raises a good point. Even though he is a part-owner in Plaintiff Doctor's Testing Center LLC II ("Doctor's Testing"), Mr. Davis may not represent Doctor's Testing in federal court because he is not a licensed attorney.² Mr. Davis is directed to obtain an attorney to represent Doctor's Testing within twenty days from the date of this Order.

Defendants' pending motions to dismiss and consolidate, and request for a stay of Rule 26

¹Doc. Nos. 17, 20, 19, 19, 17, and 19, respectively.

²28 U.S.C. § 1654; *Ackra Direct Marketing Corp. V. Fingerhut Corp.*, 86 F.3d 852, 857 (8th Cir. 1996) ("the law does not allow a corporation to proceed *pro se*"); *Lattanzio v. COMTA*, 481 F.3d 137 (2d Cir. 2007) (holding that LLC could appear in federal court only through a licensed attorney, regardless of fact that LLC had sole member and that its sole member sought to represent it).

conference, will be granted unless within twenty days a lawyer moves for additional time to respond.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 24th day of January, 2011.

/s/Billy Roy Wilson
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE