

NOT PRECEDENTIAL

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 26-1030

RONALD SATISH EMRIT, AKA Presidential Candidate P60005535; PRESIDENTIAL
COMMITTEE POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE SEPARATE SEGREGATED
FUND (SSF) NUMBER C00569897, DBA United Emrits of America

Ronald Satish Emrit,

Appellant

v.

KIM KARDASHIAN; THE CREATION OF ADAM PAINTED BY MICHAEL
ANGELO; SISTINE CHAPEL; POPE SIXTUS IV; BERING STRAIT CONNECTING
ALASKA AND RUSSIAN; GREENLAND; DENMARK; COPENHAGEN
INTERPRETATION OF QUANTUM PHYSICS/MECHANICS; SCHRODINGER'S
CAT; ERIN BURNETT, Outfront of Cable News Network (Cnn); SABINE AISHA
JULES; MARIA CHERNIAVSKA; JEFFREY RODRIGUEZ; GREGORY
LEGAGNEUR; ALEXANDRA LEGAGNEUR; DARYL CHRISTOPHER BROOKS,
a/k/a Crooks; ALDI INC, Grocery Store; ETSY INC, Online Shopping; KELLY
CLARKSON; KELLY RIPA; RYAN SEACREST; DANCING WITH THE STARS,
(Dwts); A\$AP ROCKY; ROBIN RIHANNA FENTY; YE WEST; CITY OF KEY
WEST, Florida; BLAIR WITCH, The (Moll Dyer) Of Leonardtown, Maryland Insaint
Mary's County And Not Burkittsville, Maryland in Frederick Count; OPUS DEI, (Od) Of
Vatican City; GOVERNOR ODEN BOWIE, of Collington, Maryland; MYTHICAL
PRIORY OF SION, started By Pierre Plantard of France

On Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Pennsylvania
(D.C. Civil Action No. 1:25-cv-00356)
District Judge: Honorable Susan Paradise Baxter

Submitted Pursuant to Third Circuit LAR 34.1(a)
April 16, 2026

Before: HARDIMAN, FREEMAN, and ROTH, *Circuit Judges*

(Opinion filed October 15, 2026)

OPINION*

PER CURIAM

Ronald Emrit, proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, appeals from the District Court’s order dismissing his complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). We will affirm the judgment of the District Court.

I.

Emrit, a frequent litigant, filed a complaint in the District Court against a variety of defendants, including public figures like Kim Kardashian and Ye West, inanimate objects like the Sistine Chapel and the Bering Strait, and certain private individuals, like his nephew and a Ukrainian woman of his acquaintance. His complaint is somewhat hard to follow, but he seems to allege (among other things) that public figures like Kim Kardashian and CNN correspondent Erin Burnett are responsible for “emasculat[ing] weak males,” which has caused harm to the plaintiff. After granting Emrit leave to proceed in forma pauperis, the District Court dismissed his claims without leave to amend pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), concluding that the Court lacked jurisdiction. Emrit timely appealed, and has filed an informal pro se brief in support his appeal.

* This disposition is not an opinion of the full Court and pursuant to I.O.P. 5.7 does not constitute binding precedent.

II.

We have jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo the District Court’s dismissal of Emrit’s complaint for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction. *See In re Horizon Healthcare Servs. Inc. Data Breach Litig.*, 846 F.3d 625, 632 (3d Cir. 2017).

III.

We will affirm the judgment of the District Court, because Emrit failed to provide any basis for the Court’s subject-matter jurisdiction.¹ *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(1) (requiring plaintiff to provide “a short and plain statement of the grounds for the court’s jurisdiction”). Although he mentions, in passing, the Federal Tort Claims Act in his complaint, he does not allege that any of his claims arise under that statute—or under the Constitution or any other federal laws or treaties of the United States. Instead, he pleaded state-law claims. Therefore, the District Court did not err in determining that it did not have federal question jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331.

Nor did Emrit plead diversity jurisdiction. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332, diversity jurisdiction exists in civil actions where the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000 and the opposing parties are citizens of different states. Emrit explicitly stated in his complaint that he did not meet the amount in controversy requirement; accordingly, the District Court properly concluded that Emrit failed to allege diversity jurisdiction. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1332.

¹ Emrit does not challenge the District Court’s jurisdictional ruling in his brief, instead discussing, among other things, his theory about “backwards time travel.” Br. at 4, 6.

Finally, the District Court did not err in concluding that granting Emrit leave to amend would be futile. *See Grayson v. Mayview State Hosp.*, 293 F.3d 103, 113 (3d Cir. 2002). Accordingly, we will affirm the District Court’s judgment.

We also note that Emrit has now filed several baseless appeals in this Court. *See, e.g., Emrit v. Musk*, No. 25-1221, 2025 WL 1367815 (3d Cir. May 12, 2025) (per curiam); *Emrit v. Combs*, No. 24-1269, 2024 WL 2794454 (3d Cir. May 31, 2024) (per curiam). We warn Emrit that future baseless litigation may result in financial sanctions and filing limitations.