1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	PACIFIC ELEMENTS, LLC,	Case No. 1:16-cv-01247-LJO-EPG
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER STRIKING LATE-FILED OBJECTIONS TO FINDINGS AND
13	v.	RECOMMENDATIONS
14 15	INTERFACE PROTEIN TECHNOLOGY, INC.,	(ECF No. 23)
16	Defendant.	
17		J
18	Plaintiff Pacific Elements, LLC filed this action on August 23, 2016. (ECF No. 1.) On	
19	October 21, 2016, Plaintiff filed a Motion for Default Judgment against Defendant Interface	
20	Protein Technology, Inc. (ECF No. 8.) On January 19, 2017, the Magistrate Judge issued	
21	Findings and Recommendations ("F&Rs") recommending that Defendants' motion be granted.	
22		
23	(ECF No. 20.) The F&Rs were served on Defendant with instructions that any objections must	
24	be filed within fourteen days. No party filed objections within that timeframe. On February 9,	
25	2017, in accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court conducted a de	
26 27	<i>novo</i> review of the case and entered an order adopting the F&Rs in full. (ECF No. 21.) On the	
28	same day, Judgment was entered against Defendant in the amount of \$120,479.90. (ECF. No.	

22.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

On several occasions prior to entry of judgment, a corporate officer of Defendant, Charles Han ("Han"), attempted to file responsive pleadings and oppositions in this case. (ECF Nos. 9, 15, 16.) Defendant was warned that a corporation or other business entity may only appear in federal court through counsel and was provided ample opportunity to obtain counsel. (ECF No. 18; *see also* ECF No. 20 at 3 (citing Local Rule 183(a); *Rowland v. Cal. Men's Colony, Unit II Men's Advisory Council*, 506 U.S. 194, 201-02 (1993) ("It has been the law for the better part of two centuries . . . that a corporation may appear in the federal courts only through licensed counsel.")). Despite this, Defendant did not retain counsel. Accordingly, the F&Rs recommended striking the various documents filed by Han, and the Court adopted that recommendation. (ECF Nos. 20 & 21.)

On February 9, 2017, the same day the Court adopted the F&Rs in full and entered Judgment, Han filed a document entitled "Objection to Magistrate Judge's finding and recommendations" *in propria persona*. (ECF. No. 23.) Not only does the filing provide no excuse for its untimeliness, as with the other filings discussed above, Han's objections cannot be considered because a corporation may only appear in this Court through licensed counsel. Accordingly, the Clerk of Court is directed to STRIKE the objections from the record. As a result, the record reflects no basis upon which the Court could or should reconsider its order adopting the F&Rs. The Judgment stands.

|| IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 11, 2017

/s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill UNITED STATES CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE