

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CADENCE DESIGN SYSTEMS, INC.,
Plaintiff,
v.
POUNCE CONSULTING, INC., et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 17-cv-04732-PJH

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

Re: Dkt. No. 153

On June 15, 2018, the court granted Procopio, Cory, Hargreaves & Savitch LLP’s (“Procopio”) motion to withdraw as counsel for Pounce Consulting, S.A. de C.V. (“Pounce Mexico”). Dkt. 153. That order required Procopio to continue to receive service for Pounce Mexico for 30 days or until Pounce Mexico retained substitute counsel, which Pounce Mexico was required to do within that time period. *Id.* That deadline has now passed and Pounce Mexico has not filed a notice of substitution of counsel or otherwise notified the court that new counsel has been retained.

Under clearly established law, a corporation or other artificial entity cannot appear in federal court unless it is represented by counsel. See Rowland v. California 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.”); Bourbeau v. Cognitive Code Corp., 693 F. App’x 499, 503 (9th Cir. 2017) (same; affirming district court’s dismissal based on corporation’s failure to retain counsel).

Accordingly, the court hereby ORDERS Pounce Mexico to show cause why its failure to retain counsel should not result in the court entering default against it for a

1 second time. Pounce Mexico is ordered to file a written response to this order within 14
2 days. That response shall be filed by newly retained counsel and shall be accompanied
3 by a notice of substitute counsel.

4 Procopio shall serve this order on Pounce Mexico.

5 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

6 Dated: July 17, 2018



PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON
United States District Judge

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28