1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
8		
9	ALLAN THOMAS ROCKWELL,	Case No. 1:22-cv-00392-JLT-EPG
10	Plaintiff,	FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
11	v.	RECOMMENDING THAT CLAIMS BROUGHT ON BEHALF OF MINOR
12	TUOLUMNE COUNTY, et al.,	PLAINTIFF G.A.R. BE DISMISSED
13	Defendants.	(ECF Nos. 5, 8)
14		FOURTEEN (14) DAY DEADLINE
15	Plaintiff Allan Thomas Rockwell ("Plaintiff") is proceeding pro se in this action against	
16	Tuolumne County, Michael Choate, Denise Choate, and Melissa Brouhard. (See ECF Nos. 1, 5.)	
17	For the following reasons, the Court recommends that all claims brought on behalf of minor	
18	G.A.R. be dismissed without prejudice.	
19	I. <u>BACKGROUND</u>	
20	Plaintiff initially filed the complaint on April 4, 2022. (ECF No. 1.) On April 25, 2022, Plaintiff filed a First Amended Complaint indicating that the action is brought by Plaintiff and by	
21		
22	G.A.R., a minor, proceeding <i>pro se</i> . (ECF No. 5.) On May 4, 2022, the Court issued an order for	
23	Plaintiff to show cause why G.A.R.'s claims should not be dismissed without prejudice because	
24	Plaintiff has no authority to proceed on his behalf. (ECF No. 8.)  On May 17, 2022, Plaintiff filed a response to the May 4, 2022 order to show cause, along	
25		
26	with a motion for an extension of time to file a further response. (ECF Nos. 14, 15.) Plaintiff's	
27	response explained that he was searching for counsel for G.A.R. and himself. (ECF No. 14.) And	
	he stated that if he could not obtain counsel,	"he will use FRCP 17 Next Friend rule to obtain
28		

proper representation to enter an appearance for G.A.R." (Id.)

On May 18, 2022, the Court granted Plaintiff an extension to June 30, 2022, to file a further response to the order to show cause. (ECF No. 17). However, the Court reiterated the discussion in the order to show cause—that G.A.R. must be represented by counsel if this action is to proceed on his or her behalf. (*Id.* at 2); *see Garcia v. City of Fresno*, 2017 WL 6383814, at \*4 (E.D. Cal. Dec. 14, 2017) ("It is established that a non-attorney parent must be represented by counsel in bringing an action on behalf of the child.").

On May 31, 2022, Defendants Michael Choate and Denise Choate each filed objections to minor G.A.R. proceeding pro se through Plaintiff in this case. (ECF Nos. 20, 21.)

On June 29, 2022, Plaintiff filed a motion requesting that the Court grant him permission to represent minor G.A.R. or grant him an extension of time to respond to the order to show cause and filings from Defendants objecting to him representing G.A.R. (ECF No. 35.) The Court again reiterated that Plaintiff cannot pursue a claim on behalf minor G.A.R. absent counsel and would not permit Plaintiff proceed *pro se* and pursue a claim on behalf of G.A.R., nor would the Court grant Plaintiff an extension to file a reply to Defendants' objections to him pursuing a claim on behalf of G.A.R. (ECF No. 38.) However, the Court granted Plaintiff an extension of time until July 21, 2022 to respond to the order to show cause. (*Id.*) On July 12, 2022, Defendants Michael Choate and Denise Choate filed further objections to Plaintiff representing minor G.A.R. (ECF Nos. 41, 42.)

Plaintiff has not filed any further response to the Court's order to show cause and the time to do so has expired. Thus, for the reasons discussed below, the Court will recommend that minor G.A.R.'s claims be dismissed without prejudice.

## II. DISCUSSION

The Ninth Circuit has determined that although a non-attorney may appear *pro se* in his or her own behalf, that privilege is personal to them and they have no authority to appear as an attorney for others than themselves. *C.E. Pope Equity Trust v. United States*, 818 F.2d 696, 697 (9th Cir. 1987); *Simon v. Hartford Life, Inc.*, 546 F.3d 661, 664 (9th Cir. 2008). "[A] parent or guardian cannot bring an action on behalf of a minor child without retaining a lawyer." *Johns v. County of San Diego*, 114 F.3d 874, 877 (9th Cir. 1997); *see also Wilson v. Raye*, 2020 WL

1492662, at \*2 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 27, 2020) (finding that a *pro se* plaintiff could not bring an action on behalf of a minor); *Giorgis v. Fetter*, , 2014 WL 12694301, at \*1 (D. Ariz. Dec. 22, 2014) (accord).

The First Amended Complaint states that it brings claims on behalf of G.A.R., a minor. (ECF No. 5.) However, Plaintiff is proceeding *pro se* and counsel has not appeared on G.A.R.'s behalf. As the Court has repeatedly explained to Plaintiff, G.A.R. is a minor and must be represented by counsel if this action is to proceed on his or her behalf. Plaintiff, a non-attorney proceeding *pro se*, does not have authority to appear on behalf of others, including G.A.R. Further, the Court has provided Plaintiff ample opportunity to secure counsel for G.A.R. and there has been no attorney appearance entered on G.A.R.'s behalf. Thus, the Court recommends that G.A.R.'s claims be dismissed without prejudice.

## III. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

In light of the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that all claims brought on behalf of minor G.A.R. be dismissed without prejudice.

These findings and recommendations will be submitted to the United States district judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen (14) days after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written objections with the Court. The document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Any reply to the objections shall be served and filed within fourteen (14) days after service of the objections. The parties are advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may result in the waiver of rights on appeal. *Wilkerson v. Wheeler*, 772 F.3d 834, 838-39 (9th Cir. 2014) (citing *Baxter v. Sullivan*, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991)).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **July 29, 2022** 

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE