

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
SAN JOSE DIVISION

THINK COMPUTER FOUNDATION, et
al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE
UNITED STATES COURTS, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. [14-cv-02396-BLF](#)

**ORDER RE: PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSE
TO ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

On June 13, 2014, this Court ordered Plaintiffs Think Computer Foundation and Think Computer Corporation to show cause as to why their claims should not be dismissed for failure to be represented by licensed counsel. (ECF 22 at 1) The documents that had been filed with the Court listed an “Aaron Greenspan” as appearing *pro se* on behalf of Think Computer Corporation and Think Computer Foundation. (*See, e.g.*, ECF 1, 3) It was brought to the Court’s attention that Mr. Greenspan was not an attorney licensed to practice law in California or any other state, and as such could not represent corporate or other entities before this Court.

On June 16, 2014, Plaintiffs filed a Response to the Order to Show Cause (ECF 24) and filed a First Amended Complaint (“FAC”). (ECF 23) The FAC adds Aaron Greenspan as a named Plaintiff to the action. (*See* ECF 23 at 1)


The Court’s Order to Show Cause asked that Plaintiffs provide a reason why this action should not be dismissed in its entirety for failure to be represented by counsel. The inclusion of Mr. Greenspan as a Plaintiff is sufficient to provide this reason. Though corporations may appear in court only through licensed counsel, *see, e.g., Rowland v. Calif. Men’s Colony*, 506 U.S. 194 (1993), an individual may represent himself in litigation before a federal court. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1654. Thus, Mr. Greenspan may act as counsel for himself in this litigation.

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

Plaintiffs' Response to the Order to Show Cause includes a lengthy argument as to why corporate plaintiffs should not be required to be represented by licensed counsel when appearing in court. (*See, e.g.*, ECF 24 at 9) This argument, however, is irrelevant for purposes of the Order to Show Cause. The decision to join Mr. Greenspan as Plaintiff means that he has the right to represent *himself* in this litigation, and the Court therefore declines to dismiss the entire action outright. The Court leaves for another day the determination as to whether the corporate Plaintiffs may appear without counsel properly licensed to practice law before this Court.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 17, 2014


BETH LABSON FREEMAN
United States District Judge