

1 Defendant Rohner claims that the SEC has subpoenaed non-party Dan Nims to testify at a 2 deposition and to produce certain documents and items. Dkt. #97. Defendant Rohner asks this 3 Court to quash the subpoena on behalf of this non-party. Id. Defendant Rohner is the main 4 stockholder of the Defendant corporations Inteligentry, LTD., PlasmERG, Inc., and PTP Licensing, 5 LTD. Id., at 1. This Court has already informed Defendant Rohner that, while he may represent himself as an individual, he may not represent the corporate Defendants in this case. See Dkt. # 87, 6 7 at 2-3. Now, in addition to improperly attempting to represent the corporate Defendants in this case, 8 Defendant Rohner is improperly attempting to file a motion with the Court on behalf of another 9 individual.

10

DISCUSSION

11 Defendant Rohner admits that he is not an attorney. See Doc. #97, at 7. Although a person 12 may represent himself or herself, a non-lawyer may not represent others. Rohner is not permitted to 13 engage in the unauthorized practice of law by purporting to represent or acting on behalf of the 14 corporate Defendants, non-party Nims, or anyone else. See Jackson v. United Artists Theatre 15 *Circuit, Inc.*, 278 F.R.D. 586, 596 (D. Nev. 2011) (citing *Taub v. Weber*, 366 F.3d 966, 970 (9th Cir. 16 2004) (applying Oregon law on authorized practice of law) and In re Discipline of Lerner, 197 P.3d 1067, 1069-70, 1072-73 (Nev. 2008) (what constitutes unauthorized practice of law under Nevada 17 18 law)).

Defendant Rohner, therefore may not represent either the corporate Defendants in this case,
or the non-party upon whose behalf he filed the instant motion. As stated above, the Court has
already warned Defendant Rohner that corporations are required to have licensed counsel when they
appear in federal court and that he may not represent the corporate Defendants in the instant case. *Rowland v. California Men's, Unit II Advisory Council,* 506 U.S. 194, 202 (1993). Defendant
Rohner, a non-attorney, simply may not represent any party other than himself and, therefore, his
Motion to Quash, on behalf of a non-party individual, was improperly filed.¹

26

 ²⁷ ¹To the extent Defendant Rohner asks this Court to stay discovery, that request is DENIED without prejudice. Defendant Rohner fails to cite any points and authorities in support of his request, including the correct standard for determining whether a stay of discovery is proper. *See* LR 7-2(d).

1	CONCLUSION
2	Based on the foregoing, and good cause appearing therefore,
3	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendant Rohner's Motion to Quash Deposition of
4	Investor and Licensed Manufacturer (Dkt. # 97) is DENIED.
5	DATED this 5th day of August, 2013.
6	
7	
8	NANCY J. KOPPE
9	United States Magistrate Judge
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	_ 3 _