

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA**

Steven Macarthur-Brooks Estate v. Gregory Keith

No. CV 25-2812-E (C.D. Cal. May 23, 2025) · No. No. CV 25-2812-E · Decided May 23, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California dismissed the removed action without prejudice after plaintiffs failed to comply with an order requiring them to obtain licensed counsel or show cause why the action should not be dismissed. The court held that the estate and trusts could not be represented by a non-attorney and found dismissal appropriate for failure to obey a court order and failure to prosecute. A pending motion to dismiss was denied without prejudice.

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 STEVEN MACARTHUR-BROOKS No. CV 25-2812-E ESTATE, ET AL.
12 Plaintiffs, 13 ORDER OF DISMISSAL v. 14 GREGORY KEITH, ET AL., 15 Defendants. 16
17 18 In this removed action in which the parties consented to a Magistrate Judge, the Court 19
filed a Minute Order on April 16, 2025, stating: 20 21 Steven MacArthur-Brooks, an individual
who is not licensed to practice law 22 in the state of California or before this federal Court,
purports to represent all three 23 Plaintiffs in this removed action.

As identified in the Complaint, Plaintiffs are an 24 “Estate” and two “Trusts.” Such organizations
may not be represented in court by 25 a non-attorney, and such organizations may not appear pro
se. See L.R. 83- 26 2.2.2; J.J. Rissell, Allentown PA Trust v. Marchelos, 976 F.3d 1233, 1236 (11th
27 Cir. 2020); In re America West Airlines, 40 F.3d 1058, 1059 (9th Cir.

1994); Price 1 2025); see also United States v. Brenton, 2007 WL 3124539, at *2 (D. Neb. 2 Oct.
23, 2007) (“power of attorney” does not permit court representation). 3 4 Therefore, it is ordered
that, within twenty-eight (28) days of the date of this 5 Order, Plaintiffs shall either: (1) file an
appearance by a licensed attorney 6 retained to represent Plaintiffs in this action; or (2) show
cause, if there be any, 7 why this action should not be dismissed.

Failure timely to comply with this Order 8 may result in this action being dismissed. 9 10
Plaintiffs failed timely to file anything in response to, or in attempted compliance with, the 11
April 16, 2025 Minute Order. 12 13 A district court may dismiss an action for failure to obey a
court order and for failure to 14 prosecute. See Link v. Wabash Railroad Co., 370 U.S. 626, 629-
33 (1962); Pagtalunan v. 15 Galaza, 291 F.3d 639, 642-43 (9th Cir.

2002), cert. denied, 538 U.S. 909 (2003); *Ferdik v. 16 Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-62 (9th Cir.), cert. denied, 506 U.S. 915 (1992). This Court 17 has considered the factors recited in *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, and has concluded that dismissal 18 without prejudice is appropriate for essentially the same reasons stated by the Court in *Price 19 v. Kaiser Found. Health Plan Inc.*, 2025 WL 790944 (C.D.

Cal. March 11, 2025). The Court 20 also observes that the present case is not the first time Steven Macarthur-Brooks has been 21 advised by a federal court that he may not represent organizations in court. See *Steven 22 Macarthur-Brooks Estate v. Moreno*, 2025 WL 30390, at *10 (S.D. Fla. Jan. 6, 2025). 23 /// 24 /// 25 /// 26 /// 27 /// 1 Therefore, the action is dismissed without prejudice. ' 2 3 LET JUDGMENT BE ENTERED ACCORDINGLY.

4 5 Dated: May 23, 2025. 6 (LEZ CHARLES F. EICK 8 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 |; ——— (__ In light of this disposition, the Motion to Dismiss, filed April 22, 2025, is denied without prejudice.

Under the present circumstances, a dismissal of this action with prejudice 28 would be inappropriate under the *Ferdik v. Bonzelet* factors.