

1 22.)

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

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

25 IT IS SO ORDERED.

26 Dated: February 11, 2017

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

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