

COURT OF APPEALS OF ARKANSAS, DIVISION IV

Harding Logistics Inc. v. Director

2026 Ark. App. 355 · No. No. E-26-42 · Decided May 20, 2026

SUMMARY

The Arkansas Court of Appeals dismissed Harding Logistics Inc.'s appeal from a Board of Review decision granting unemployment benefits to the claimant. The court held that the corporation's petition was null and void because it was signed and filed by the company's president, who was not a licensed attorney, leaving the court without jurisdiction.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals of Arkansas, Division IV
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Waymond M. Brown; Abramson; Murphy
JURISDICTION	Arkansas Court of Appeals, Division IV
DECIDED	May 20, 2026
DOCKET	No. E-26-42
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Harding Logistics Inc. appealed the Arkansas Board of Review's decision granting unemployment benefits to claimant Michael Kirkham. The court dismissed the appeal for lack of jurisdiction because the corporation's petition was signed and filed by Randy Harding, a nonlawyer.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published
PARTIES	Harding Logistics Inc. v. Director, Division of Workforce Services

TOPICS

- appellate jurisdiction
- appellate procedure
- unemployment benefits
- administrative law
- corporate law

PRACTICE AREAS

- appellate procedure
- administrative law
- unemployment benefits
- corporate law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether a corporation may invoke the jurisdiction of the Arkansas Court of Appeals through a petition signed and filed by a nonlawyer president.
2. Whether the court had jurisdiction over an appeal initiated by a corporation through a nonlawyer representative.

HOLDINGS

1. A nonlawyer may not represent a corporation in court, and a petition filed on behalf of the corporation by that nonlawyer is null and void.
2. The court lacked jurisdiction over the appeal because the corporation's petition was null and void, and the appeal was dismissed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Therefore, since Harding is not an attorney and was practicing law when he signed the petition, the petition is null and void.”

“As a result, we lack jurisdiction and dismiss this appeal.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Michael Kirkham applied for unemployment benefits after leaving his last job, and the agency initially denied benefits because it found that he had quit without good cause connected to the work. The Appeal Tribunal affirmed the denial, but the Board of Review reversed that decision and granted benefits. Harding Logistics sought appellate review through a petition signed by its president, Randy Harding, who was not a licensed attorney and acknowledged that the corporation was unrepresented by counsel.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

An agency denied Kirkham's application for unemployment benefits on the ground that he quit without good cause connected to the work. The Appeal Tribunal affirmed, but the Board of Review reversed and granted benefits. Harding Logistics timely appealed to the Arkansas Court of Appeals, where its petition was filed by the corporation's president, who was not a licensed attorney.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Nirvana Med. Spa v. Dir., 2024 Ark. App. 284
- IHOP #1914 v. Dir., 2023 Ark. App. 102
- Super 8 Motel v. Dir., 2019 Ark. App. 555

OPINION

Harding Logistics Inc. v. Director 2026 Ark. App. 355

PER CURIAM.

Cite as 2026 Ark. App. 355

ARKANSAS COURT OF APPEALS

DIVISION IV

No. E-26-42 HARDING LOGISTICS INC. Opinion Delivered May 20, 2026

APPEAL FROM THE ARKANSAS

APPELLANT BOARD OF REVIEW

V. [NO. 2026-BR-00026]

DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF

WORKFORCE SERVICES DISMISSED

APPELLEE

WAYMOND M. BROWN, Judge The claimant, Michael Kirkham, timely appealed to the Appeal Tribunal an Agency determination denying his application for unemployment benefits because he had quit his last job without good cause connected to the work. The Tribunal affirmed the denial of benefits, so Kirkham appealed that decision to the Board of Review. On February 19, 2026, the Board issued its decision reversing the Tribunal's decision and granted Kirkham, the claimant, unemployment benefits. The employer, Harding Logistics Inc., timely appealed that decision to this court. We dismiss for lack of jurisdiction. On March 16, 2026, Harding Logistics filed its petition with this court. This petition was signed by Randy Harding, the president of the company, who is not a licensed attorney. Our supreme court has held that when a party not licensed to practice law in this state attempts to represent the interests of others by submitting to the jurisdiction of a court, those actions, such as the filing of pleadings, are rendered a nullity. 1 Additionally, Harding indicated in the petition that Harding Logistics, a corporation, was not represented by an attorney. Because he is not an attorney, he cannot represent Harding Logistics in this case.² It is well settled that invoking the process of a court of law constitutes the practice of law.³ Therefore, since Harding is not an attorney and was practicing law when he signed the petition, the petition is null and void.⁴ As a result, we lack jurisdiction and dismiss this appeal. Dismissed. ABRAMSON and MURPHY, JJ., agree. Randy Harding, pro se appellant. Cynthia L. Uhrynowycz, for appellee. 1 Nirvana Med. Spa v. Dir., 2024 Ark. App. 284 (citing IHOP #1914 v. Dir., 2023 Ark. App. 102 (holding that corporations must be represented by licensed attorneys)). 2 Id. 3 Super 8 Motel v. Dir., 2019 Ark. App. 555. 4 Id. 2