

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](#)

**CORRECTED ORDER TO SHOW
CAUSE AS TO WHY THE COMPLAINT
SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED**

[Re: Dkt. Nos. 11, 19]

TO PLAINTIFFS THINK COMPUTER FOUNDATION AND THINK COMPUTER
CORPORATION:

YOU ARE HEREBY ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE WHY PLAINTIFFS' CLAIMS
SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED PURSUANT TO LOCAL RULE 3-9(B) AND FEDERAL COURT
PRECEDENT FOR FAILURE TO BE REPRESENTED BY LICENSED COUNSEL ON THE
GROUNDS SET FORTH BELOW.

On May 23, 2014, Plaintiffs filed a Complaint in the above-captioned action. (ECF 1) On that
same date, Plaintiffs filed a Motion with the Court seeking permission for electronic case filing. (ECF
3) Both documents list "Aaron Greenspan" as appearing pro se *on behalf of* Think Computer
Corporation and Think Computer Foundation.

The rules of this Court make clear that a corporation or other entity may appear in Court *only*
through an attorney licensed to practice law before the Court. Civil L-R 3-9(b) ("A corporation,
unincorporated association, partnership, or other such entity may appear only through a member of the
bar of this Court."). The United States Supreme Court has held that such rules are constitutional, *see*
Rowland v. Calif. Men's Colony, 506 U.S. 194 (1993), and the Ninth Circuit has upheld district court

1 orders entering default judgment against a Plaintiff entity that refused to retain counsel for the duration
2 of litigation. United States v. High Country Broad. Co., 3 F.3d 1244, 1245 (1993).

3 It has been brought to the Court's attention that Mr. Greenspan is not an attorney licensed to
4 practice law in the state of California, (ECF 11) and as such, under the prevailing law and rules of this
5 Court, cannot represent an entity in action before this Court.

6 THE COURT hereby issues an ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE why Plaintiffs' claims should not
7 be dismissed for failure to be represented by counsel, pursuant to Civil Local Rule 3-9(b) and
8 prevailing case law.

9 This Order hereby corrects and supersedes the Court's June 11, 2014 Order to Show Cause.
10 The previously issued order contained a typographical error regarding the due date for Plaintiffs'
11 response to this Order. The deadline for responding to the Order to Show Cause will now be **July 13,**
12 **2014**, thirty (30) days from the issuance of this corrected Order. If Plaintiff fails to file a response, the
13 case shall be dismissed. The Court shall not hold a hearing on this Order unless otherwise stated.
14

15 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

16 Dated: June 13, 2014

17 
18 HON. BETH LABSON FREEMAN
19 United States District Judge
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28