1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 8 9 LICIA CAMARA. Case No. 1:17-cv-00490-LJO-MJS 10 11 Plaintiff, ORDER DENYING, WITHOUT PREJUDICE, FIRST REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE ANSWER 12 ٧. **BARGAIN BUNCH** 13 (ECF NO. 6) 14 Defendant. 15 16 17 18 On June 5, 2017, a motion for extension of time to file an answer was filed on 19 behalf of Defendant Bargain Bunch. The motion was submitted by "Bargain Bunch, pro 20 se." It is signed by an unidentified individual and the signature is illegible. 21 Pursuant to Rule 11(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, any motion must 22 be signed by "at least one attorney of record in the attorney's name--or by a party 23 personally if the party is unrepresented." Here, it is unclear who submitted the motion on

behalf of Bargain Bunch, that person's relationship to Bargain Bunch, that person's

authority to appear in court on behalf of Bargain Bunch, and whether Bargain Bunch

may be permitted to appear without an attorney in this action. Compare Rowland v. Cal.

Men's Colony, 506 U.S. 194, 201-202 (1993) (noting that 28 U.S.C. § 1654 does not

24

25

26

27

28

allow corporations, partnerships, or associations to appear in federal court other than through a licensed attorney), and Licht v. Am. W. Airlines, 40 F.3d 1058, 1059 (9th Cir. 1994) ("Corporations and other unincorporated associations must appear in court through an attorney."), with National Independent Theatre Exhibitors, Inc. v. Buena Vista Distribution Co., 748 F.2d 602, 609-10 (11th Cir. 1984) (noting that pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1654, a sole proprietor could appear in federal court pro se). Absent some indication that the motion was filed by an attorney or an individual with authority to proceed pro se on behalf of Bargain Bunch is this action, the motion must be denied.

Accordingly, the motion is HEREBY DENIED without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 8, 2017