

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Ronald Satish Emrit v. Computer Programmers and App Developers
Working for Central Intelligence Agency CIA in Langley et al.

Emrit · No. 2:25-cv-10838-SB-BFM · Decided November 20, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California dismissed Ronald Satish Emrit’s in forma pauperis action with prejudice under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). The court concluded that the complaint’s allegations were clearly baseless and frivolous, and stated that judgment would be separately entered.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Stanley Blumenfeld, Jr.
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	November 20, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-10838-SB-BFM
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	A self-represented plaintiff seeking leave to proceed in forma pauperis filed an action asserting claims for industrial espionage, public nuisance, and tortious interference with business relations or contracts. The district court screened the complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) and dismissed the action with prejudice as frivolous.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B); dismissal is authorized when an in forma pauperis complaint is frivolous or fails to state a claim for relief.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Ronald Satish Emrit v. Computer Programmers and App Developers Working for Central Intelligence Agency CIA in Langley et al.

TOPICS

civil procedure

motions to dismiss

pleadings

torts

punitive damages

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

federal courts

civil rights

torts

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint should be dismissed as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).
2. Whether the complaint's factual allegations were sufficiently irrational or wholly incredible to qualify as factually frivolous.
3. Whether dismissal of the frivolous pro se complaint should be with prejudice and without leave to amend.

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint was frivolous because its allegations were clearly baseless and its factual contentions rose to the level of the irrational or wholly incredible.
2. A district court may dismiss a frivolous pro se complaint without leave to amend; the complaint here was properly dismissed with prejudice.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“To this end, the statute accords judges not only the authority to dismiss a claim based on an indisputably meritless legal theory, but also the unusual power to pierce the veil of the complaint’s factual allegations and dismiss those claims whose factual contentions are clearly baseless.”

“A complaint is factually frivolous “when the facts alleged rise to the level of the irrational or the wholly incredible[.]””

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff sued more than 15 defendants, including entities and individuals associated with computer programming, technology, media, and commercial activities. He asserted claims characterized as industrial espionage, public nuisance, and tortious interference, based on allegations that computer programmers and app developers could control human behavior like video-game players control game characters. The complaint included highly speculative assertions concerning technology companies, gamers, and drug use, and sought \$45 million in punitive, compensatory, and treble damages.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed the complaint against more than 15 defendants and sought \$45 million in punitive, compensatory, and treble damages, among other relief. The district court conducted the required in forma pauperis screening and concluded that the complaint's allegations were clearly baseless and factually frivolous. The court dismissed the action with prejudice and stated that judgment would be separately entered.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Lopez v. Smith, 203 F.3d 1122, 1129 (9th Cir. 2000)
- Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 327 (1989)
- Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 33 (1992)
- Molski v. Evergreen Dynasty Corp., 500 F.3d 1047, 1061 (9th Cir. 2007)
- Watison v. Carter, 668 F.3d 1108, 1112 (9th Cir. 2012)
- Cato v. United States, 70 F.3d 1103, 1106 (9th Cir. 1995)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-central-district-of-cal/2025/ronald-satish-emrit-v-computer-programmers-and-app-9uizrgap>