

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