

1 Only a licensed attorney—an active member of the State Bar of Nevada admitted to
2 practice under the Nevada Supreme Court Rules— is authorized to represent a client in Nevada.
3 *Guerin v. Guerin*, 993 P.2d 1256, 1258 (Nev. 2000) (citing NRS 7.285); *Martinez v. Eighth Jud.*
4 *Dist. Ct.*, 729 P.2d 487, 488 (Nev. 1986) (an individual “has no right to be represented by an agent
5 other than counsel in a court of law”). In federal courts “the parties may plead and conduct their
6 own cases *personally or by counsel.*” 28 U.S.C. § 1654 (emphasis added). Although an individual
7 is entitled to represent himself or herself, no rule or statute permits a non-attorney to represent any
8 other person, a company, a trust, or any other entity. *Jackson v. United Artists Theatre Circuit,*
9 *Inc.*, 278 F.R.D. 586, 596 (D. Nev. 2011); *Salman v. Newell*, 885 P.2d 607, 608 (Nev. 1994). Thus,
10 pro se parties may not pursue claims on behalf of others in a representative capacity. *See, e.g.,*
11 *Simon v. Hartford Life, Inc.*, 546 F.3d 661, 664–65 (9th Cir. 2008) (collecting cases and noting
12 that courts routinely prohibit pro se plaintiffs “from pursuing claims on behalf of others in a
13 representative capacity”); *Russell v. United States*, 308 F.2d 78, 79 (9th Cir. 1962) (“A litigant
14 appearing in propria persona has no authority to represent anyone other than himself.”).

15 Additionally, a parent or guardian may not bring suit in federal court on behalf of their
16 child without first retaining an attorney. *Johns v. County of San Diego*, 114 F.3d 874, 876 (9th
17 Cir. 1997); *see also Buran v. Riggs*, 5 F. Supp. 3d 1212, 1215 (D. Nev. 2014) (noting that father
18 could not bring an action on his minor son’s behalf without retaining a lawyer; even if he could
19 not afford to hire a licensed attorney). Rule 17 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires a
20 court to “appoint a guardian ad litem--or issue another appropriate order--to protect a minor or
21 incompetent person who is unrepresented in an action.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 17(c)(2). Under Rule
22 17(c), a district court has “a legal obligation to consider” whether a minor or incompetent litigant
23 is “adequately protected.” *Davis v. Walker*, 745 F.3d 1303, 1312 (9th Cir. 2014).

24 As the relevant statutes and case law demonstrates, Ms. Pyankovska is not authorized to
25 file documents or make representations to the court on behalf of A.A., I.N., or Rickey Marquez.

26 Accordingly,

27 ///

28 ///

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

IT IS ORDERED:

1. Plaintiff Lyudmyla Pyankovska’s Motion for Permission for Electronic Case Filing (ECF No. 17) is GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART:

- a. She is authorized to file documents on behalf of herself.
- b. She is *not authorized* to file documents on behalf of A.A., I.N., or Rickey Marquez, either electronically or by physically submitting filings to the Clerk of the Court.

2. Plaintiff must comply with the following procedures in order to activate her CM/ECF account:

- a. On or before **April 28, 2017**, Plaintiff must complete the CM/ECF tutorial, which is accessible on the court’s website www.nvd.uscourts.gov in the Civil & Criminal Events Menu, and file certification indicating that she is familiar with the electronic filing procedures and best practices.
- b. Plaintiff is not authorized to file electronically unless the certification is filed with the court within the specified time frame.
- c. Upon timely filing of the certification, Plaintiff shall contact Robert Johnson at the CM/ECF Help Desk at (702) 464-5555 to set up a CM/ECF account.

Dated this 3rd day of April, 2017.



PEGGY A. LEEN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE