

IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

-----ooOoo-----

Federated Financial Corporation,	)	MEMORANDUM DECISION
	)	(Not For Official Publication)
Plaintiff and Appellee,	)	Case No. 20100182-CA
	)	
v.	)	F I L E D
	)	(July 1, 2010)
<u>Sandi L. Snowden</u> ; and Rocky Mountain Electric of Utah, LLC,	)	2010 UT App 179
	)	
Defendant and Appellant.	)	

-----

Fourth District, American Fork Department, 080104349  
The Honorable Howard Maetani

Attorneys: Sandi L. Snowden, Orem, Appellant Pro Se  
Stephen B. Elggren, Sandy, for Appellee

-----

Before Judges Orme, Thorne, and Voros.

PER CURIAM:

Sandi L. Snowden appeals the judgment entered by the district court on February 8, 2010. This matter is before the court on a sua sponte motion for summary disposition on the basis that the grounds for appeal are so insubstantial that they do not merit further proceedings or consideration by this court. We affirm.

In the first instance, Snowden has purportedly filed a response to the motion for summary disposition on behalf of herself and Rocky Mountain Electric of Utah, LLC. However, the notice of appeal filed with the district court indicated that only Snowden was appealing the judgment. Thus, Rocky Mountain Electric, is not a party to this appeal. See Utah R. App. P. 3(b) (requiring multiple parties to an action who desire to appeal a final order of the district court to either file a joint notice of appeal or separate notices of appeal). Further, even if Rocky Mountain Electric were a proper party in this appeal, Snowden could not represent its interests. See Hartford Leasing Corp. v. State, 888 P.2d 694, 700 (Utah Ct. App. 1994) (stating that an entity's status as a corporation "precludes self-

representation because corporations are artificial entities that are not allowed to represent themselves in court").

The district court entered its judgment after it struck Snowden's pleadings for discovery violations. Snowden does not allege that the district court erred in so ruling. Instead, Snowden raises several issues concerning the merits of her defenses to the claims made by Federated Financial Corporation. Because the district court entered the judgment after striking Snowden's answer, the merits of her underlying defense are not properly before this court.

Affirmed.<sup>1</sup>

---

Gregory K. Orme, Judge

---

William A. Thorne Jr., Judge

---

J. Frederic Voros Jr., Judge

---

<sup>1</sup>Federated Financial asserts that Snowden's appeal is frivolous and requests attorney fees under rule 33 of the Utah Rules of Appellate Procedure. See Utah R. App. P. 33. Federated Financial's request for attorney fees is denied.