

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUN 1 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

SHIN-LIN LIU,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

BANK OF AMERICA, N.A., a national
bank,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 25-757

D.C. No. 4:23-cv-05211-JSW

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of California
Jeffrey S. White, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted May 26, 2026**

Before: S.R. THOMAS, MILLER, and H.A. THOMAS, Circuit Judges.

Shin-Lin Liu appeals pro se from the district court's order dismissing his diversity action alleging claims concerning funds transferred from a bank account belonging to his limited liability company. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C.

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

§ 1291. We review de novo the district court’s decision to grant a motion to dismiss. *Mudpie, Inc. v. Travelers Cas. Ins. Co. of Am.*, 15 F.4th 885, 889 (9th Cir. 2021). We affirm.

The district court properly determined that Liu was not the real party in interest and therefore had no standing to pursue his claims. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 17(a)(1) (establishing that “[a]n action must be prosecuted in the name of the real party in interest”).

To the extent Liu purports to appeal on behalf of the limited liability company, Liu lacks standing because he is not a licensed attorney and cannot represent the company in federal court. *See Rowland v. Cal. Men’s Colony, Unit II Men’s Advisory Council*, 506 U.S. 194, 202 (1993) (explaining that “a corporation may appear in the federal courts only through licensed counsel”); *C.E. Pope Equity Tr. v. United States*, 818 F.2d 696, 698 (9th Cir. 1987) (explaining that “a non-attorney . . . has no authority to appear as an attorney for others than himself”).

We do not consider contentions and allegations raised for the first time on appeal. *See Padgett v. Wright*, 587 F.3d 983, 985 n.2 (9th Cir. 2009).

All pending motions and requests are denied.

AFFIRMED.