

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

OPINION

Emrit

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RONALD SATISH EMRIT, Case No. 2:25-cv-10838-SB-BFM Plaintiff,

v. ORDER DISMISSING ACTION

WITH PREJUDICE

COMPUTER PROGRAMMERS AND

APP DEVELOPERS WORKING FOR

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

AGENCY CIA IN LANGLEY et al., Defendants. Plaintiff Ronald Emrit, a self-represented litigant seeking to proceed in forma pauperis, filed this action against over 15 defendants asserting claims for “industrial espionage,” public nuisance, and tortious interference with business relations or contracts. The Court screens the complaint, as required, to determine if it is “frivolous” or “fails to state a claim” for relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i)–(ii); *Lopez v. Smith*, 203 F.3d 1122, 1129 (9th Cir. 2000) (noting that “section 1915(e) applies to all in forma pauperis complaints, not just those filed by prisoners”). I. This action is the latest in a series of complaints filed in this district describing Plaintiff’s various grievances with defendants including the “Wikipedia Search Engine,” “Will Arnett of Reeses Commercials,” “Saturday Night Live,” and “Jake from State Farm.” See Case Nos. 2:25-cv-10832-MCS-PD, 2:25-cv-10840- JAK-AJR, 2:25-cv-10843-MCS-JC, 2:25-cv-09730-CV-SK. In this case, he starts by musing whether “Bill Gates is a devil-worshiper or perhaps Lucifer himself” (Dkt. No. 1 at 6) and then launches into what appears to be an attack on computer technology. In the section of the complaint titled, “Nature of the Case,” he alleges: The plaintiff argues that computer programmers and app developers can control human behavior in the same manner that gamers control video game characters because Congress is slow and confused and does not know how to regulate technology companies with the “gamer mentality from Silicon Valley” in which some people theorize that they hustle by staying up all night long and even taking “Crystal Meth” (the gamers) so that they won’t fall asleep while programming their apps in Northern California culture. Americans don’t want gamers high on

Meth controlling human behavior and that it is why it is important for Americans to file lawsuits and to create judge-made law or common law as Congress is slow to create black- letter law from bicameralism and presentment. Dkt. No. 1 ¶¶ 1–2, 18 (emphases in original). In this prayer for relief, Plaintiff seeks \$45,000,000 in punitive, compensatory, and treble damages, among other relief. Id. at 10 of 16. II. A district court may dismiss a plaintiff’s complaint under § 1915(e) as frivolous. *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 327 (1989). “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.” Id. A complaint is factually frivolous “when the facts alleged rise to the level of the irrational or the wholly incredible[.]” *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 33 (1992); see *Molski v. Evergreen Dynasty Corp.*, 500 F.3d 1047, 1061 (9th Cir. 2007) (noting that a plaintiff “may cross the line into frivolous litigation by asserting facts that are grossly exaggerated or totally false”). Although pro se filings are ordinarily liberally construed, *Watson v. Carter*, 668 F.3d 1108, 1112 (9th Cir. 2012), district courts may dismiss a frivolous pro se complaint without leave to amend, *Lopez*, 203 F.3d at 1127 n.8. Because Plaintiff’s allegations are “clearly baseless,” rendering the lawsuit frivolous, the complaint is dismissed with prejudice. See *Cato v. United States*, 70 F.3d 1103, 1106 (9th Cir. 1995) (affirming district court’s decision to dismiss frivolous complaint with prejudice). Judgment will be separately entered. Date: November 20, 2025 _____ Stanley Blumenfeld, Jr. United States District Judge