



NUMBER 13-20-00219-CV

COURT OF APPEALS

THIRTEENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS

CORPUS CHRISTI – EDINBURG

**GONZALES RENTAL PROPERTIES,
LLC,**

Appellant,

v.

**AMERICAN EXPRESS NATIONAL
BANK F/K/A AMERICAN EXPRESS
BANK, FSB,**

Appellee.

**On appeal from the 25th District Court
of Gonzales County, Texas.**

MEMORANDUM OPINION

**Before Justices Hinojosa, Perkes, and Tijerina
Memorandum Opinion by Justice Tijerina**

Pro se appellant Michael Scott Hanson a/k/a Mike Hanson filed an appeal on behalf of himself and Gonzalez Rental Properties, LLC (Gonzalez Rental) in appellate cause number 13-18-00462-CV from a judgment entered by the 25th Judicial District

Court, Gonzalez County, Texas. On December 27, 2018, appellee American Express National Bank f/k/a American Express Bank, FSB filed a motion requesting that we dismiss Gonzalez Rental's appeal because it was not represented by a licensed attorney.

Corporations must be represented by a licensed attorney. See *Kunstoplast of Am., Inc. v. Formosa Plastics Corp., USA*, 937 S.W.2d 455, 456 (Tex. 1996); *Nevada Gold & Silver, Inc. v. Andrews Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 225 S.W.3d 68, 70 n.1 (Tex. App.—El Paso 2005, no pet.); see also *Dell Dev. Corp. v. Best Indus. Unif. Supply Co., Inc.*, 743 S.W.2d 302, 303 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1987, writ denied) (holding that a corporation cannot be represented pro se by an officer who is not an attorney). Although “Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 7 provides that ‘[a]ny party to a suit may appear and prosecute or defend his rights therein, either in person or by an attorney of the court[,]’ the Rule does not permit a corporation to appear through an agent who is not a licensed attorney.” *McClane v. New Caney Oaks Apartments*, 416 S.W.3d 115, 120 (Tex. App.—Beaumont 2013, no pet.).

On April 3, 2019, this Court sent a letter to the parties asking that Gonzalez Rental obtain appellate counsel and file a notice of counsel's appearance on or before Tuesday April 14, 2020. Gonzalez Rental did not respond to our letter. Having considered the documents on file, this Court is of the opinion that Gonzalez Rental's appeal should be dismissed. See TEX. R. APP. P. 42.3(a). Appellee's motion is GRANTED, and we DISMISS Gonzalez Rental's appeal. Costs will be taxed against Gonzalez Rental. See TEX. R. APP. P. 42.1(d) (“Absent agreement of the parties, the court will tax costs against the appellant.”). Having dismissed Gonzalez Rental's appeal, no motion for rehearing will be entertained, and our mandate will issue forthwith.

JAIME TIJERINA,
Justice

Delivered and filed the
18th day of June, 2020.