IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS

KENDRA ROSS, **Plaintiff,** **v.** **ROYALL JENKINS, et al.,** **Defendants.**	**Case No. 17-2547-DDC-TJJ**
KENDRA ROSS, **Plaintiff,** **v.** **THE PROMISE KEEPERS, INC. et al,** **Defendants.**	**Case No. 19-2091-DDC-TJJ**

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

Since the court entered judgment, a number of persons have submitted various things to the clerk of the court. Typically, these filings are signed by individuals who are neither parties to this action nor admitted to practice law before our court. *See, e.g.*, Docs. 195, 197, 198, 201, 202, 210, 211, 215, 216, 217, 220, and 221. In doing so, these individuals have tried to circumvent clearly established law that governs cases in the District of Kansas. Specifically, the law in our Circuit and district prohibits a person not admitted to practice law to represent or otherwise act on behalf of another person or a corporate entity. *Harrison v. Wahatoyas, L.L.C.*, 253 F.3d 552, 556 (10th Cir. 2001) (citing *Flora Constr. Co. v. Fireman's Fund Ins. Co.*, 307

F.2d 413, 414 (10th Cir. 1962) ("The rule is well established that a corporation can appear in a court of record only by an attorney at law.")); *Tal v. Hogan*, 453 F.3d 1244, 1254 n.8 (10th Cir. 2006) (collecting cases); *Perry v. Stout*, No. 00-2411, 2001 WL 1158997, at *1 (10th Cir. Sept. 28, 2001) (citing 28 U.S.C. § 1654 ("parties may plead and conduct their own cases personally or by counsel")).

In short, these filers have tried to assume the responsibilities and duties of a practicing lawyer without establishing the necessary qualifications. As the court has noted many times, the docket reflects that no attorney admitted to practice before this court has entered an appearance on behalf of Royall Jenkins. Similarly, the docket reflects that no attorney admitted to practice before this court has entered an appearance on behalf of The Value Creators, Inc., The Promise Keepers, Inc., or any other entity who is a defendant in this case, or a related consolidated case, *Ross v. The Promise Keepers, Inc.*, No. 2:19-cv-02091-DDC-TJJ (D. Kan. Feb. 15, 2019).

Thus, in the interest of judicial efficiency, the court will strike all future motions filed in this case by individuals who are neither parties to the case nor attorneys licensed to practice law in this court.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 23rd day of August, 2019, at Kansas City, Kansas.

s/ Daniel D. Crabtree
Daniel D. Crabtree
United States District Judge