

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 12-1432**

---

MR CRESCENT CITY, LLC; MCCRARY CRESCENT CITY, LLC; MICHAEL  
C. MCCRARY,

Plaintiffs - Appellees,

v.

TJ BISCAYNE HOLDINGS LLC; MARKET STREET PROPERTIES PALM  
BEACH, LLC; STUART C. FISHER,

Defendants - Appellants,

and

EDWARD V. GIANNASCA, II; GIANNASCA CRESCENT CITY LLC,  
CRESCENT CITY ESTATES, LLC; TAMARA J. FISHER,

Defendants.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
Maryland, at Baltimore. Marvin J. Garbis, Senior District  
Judge. (1:11-cv-01039-MJG)

---

Submitted: March 21, 2013

Decided: March 28, 2013

---

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed in part, dismissed in part by unpublished per curiam  
opinion.

---

Stuart C. Neil Fisher, Appellant Pro Se. Kenneth B. Frank,  
MURPHY, FALCON & MURPHY, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Stuart C. Neil Fisher appeals the district court's order affirming the bankruptcy court's order finding Fisher and several of his codefendants in the bankruptcy suit jointly and severally responsible for \$181,221.73 in costs and attorneys' fees, which it awarded to the parties who opposed the attempt by Fisher and his codefendants to remove a Maryland state court action to the bankruptcy court.

We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the district court as it pertains to Fisher. See TJ Biscayne Holdings, LLC v. MR Crescent City, LLC, No. 1:11-cv-01039-MJG (D. Md. Mar. 2, 2012). Because Fisher's fellow appellants TJ Biscayne Holdings LLC and Market Street Properties Palm Beach, LLC are not represented by an attorney in this court, we dismiss their appeals of the district court's order. See Rowland v. California Men's Colony, 506 U.S. 194, 201-02 (1993) ("It has been the law for the better part of two centuries . . . that a corporation may appear in the federal courts only through licensed counsel."); United States v. Hagerman, 545 F.3d 579, 581-82 (7th Cir. 2008) (LLCs, like corporations, are not permitted to proceed pro se).

We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials

before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED IN PART;  
DISMISSED IN PART