

NOT PRECEDENTIAL

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 26-1273

STANLEY ARISTILDE,
Estate Ex Rel Aristilde, Stanley in Propria Persona Siu Juris, Sui Heredes,
Appellant

v.

JOHN CAPOBIANCO, d/b/a Magisterial District Judge (3-2-08) in Official/Private
Capacity; RENEE FONT, Police Officer Badge #948 of Colonial Regional Police
Department; KYLE C. STOUT, d/b/a Police Badge #5010 of Nazareth Police
Department; DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, CENTRAL
COMMUNICATION OFFICE

On Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania
(D.C. Civil Action No. 5:26-cv-00166)
District Judge: Honorable Joseph F. Leeson

Submitted Pursuant to Third Circuit LAR 34.1(a)
August 3, 2026
Before: CHAGARES *Chief Judge*, HARDIMAN and FREEMAN, *Circuit Judges*

(Opinion filed August 31, 2026)

OPINION*

PER CURIAM

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

Stanley Aristilde appeals from an order dismissing his complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). We will affirm.

Aristilde filed a complaint which the District Court reasonably construed as alleging that his civil rights were violated when he was given two traffic tickets and his driver's license was suspended.¹ The District Court granted Aristilde leave to proceed in forma pauperis and dismissed the complaint because it was frivolous and failed to state a claim on which relief could be granted. The District Court did so with prejudice because it concluded that amendment would be futile.

Aristilde appeals, and we have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We exercise de novo review over the dismissal of his complaint, *see Dooley v. Wetzel*, 957 F.3d 366, 373–74 (3d Cir. 2020), and we review the denial of leave to amend for abuse of discretion. *See id.* at 376.

In his brief, Aristilde does not coherently explain how the District Court erred in the course of its detailed, thoughtful analysis. Having carefully reviewed the record, we agree with the District Court that Aristilde has not asserted any discernible actionable claim, nor do his filings suggest he could have asserted such a claim.

For these reasons, we will affirm the judgment of the District Court. Aristilde's motions are denied.

¹ As the District Court noted, his complaint is not a model of clarity.