

NOT PRECEDENTIAL

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 26-1274

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

v.

NEW YORK STATE OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER;
OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL NEW YORK;
BUREAU OF THE FISCAL SERVICE;
727 NORTH MEADOW STREET LLC;
NORRIS MCLAUGHLIN

On Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania
(D.C. Civil Action No. 5:26-cv-00339)
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 arising from a state court eviction proceeding.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. *Id.*

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.