

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Presidential Candidate Number P60005535, also known as Ronald Satish Emrit, and Presidential Committee/Political Action Committee/Separate Segregated Fund (SSF) Number C00569897 d/b/a United Emrits of America v. Kim Kardashian, Kris Jenner, Khloe Kardashian, Kourtney Kardashian, Robert Kardashian, Jr., Kendall Jenner, Kylie Jenner, Caitlin Jenner, Kanye “Ye” West, Lamar Odom, and Travis Scott

Emrit v. Kardashian · No. 3:25-cv-2695-JES-VET · Decided October 20, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of California dismissed Ronald Satish Emrit’s complaint against Kim Kardashian and other defendants without prejudice for lack of Article III standing. The court also denied Emrit’s motion to proceed in forma pauperis as moot and directed the Clerk of Court to close the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	James E. Simmons, Jr.
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
DECIDED	October 20, 2025
DOCKET	3:25-cv-2695-JES-VET
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Pro se plaintiff filed a civil complaint and a concurrent motion to proceed in forma pauperis. The district court screened the complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e), dismissed it without prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction based on lack of Article III standing, and denied the IFP motion as moot.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Mandatory sua sponte screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B); the complaint must be dismissed if it is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim, or seeks monetary relief from an immune defendant.

PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown
PARTIES	Presidential Candidate Number P60005535, also known as Ronald Satish Emrit, Presidential Committee/Political Action Committee/Separate Segregated Fund (SSF) Number C00569897 d/b/a United Emrits of America v. Kim Kardashian, Kris Jenner, Khloe Kardashian, Kourtney Kardashian, Robert Kardashian, Jr., Kendall Jenner, Kylie Jenner, Caitlin Jenner, Kanye “Ye” West, Lamar Odom, Travis Scott

TOPICS

standing subject matter jurisdiction civil procedure ada / disability motions to dismiss

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure constitutional law federal jurisdiction in forma pauperis screening standing

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiff alleged Article III standing to pursue claims based on the alleged denial of a Section 8 housing voucher, alleged interference with business or family relations, and alleged conduct directed at public figures.
2. Whether the complaint should be dismissed during screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(h)(3) for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.
3. Whether plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis should be denied as moot after dismissal of the complaint.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiff lacked standing because he did not allege a concrete and particularized injury caused by any defendant that could likely be redressed by judicial relief.
2. The complaint was dismissed without prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction because plaintiff lacked standing.
3. The motion to proceed in forma pauperis was denied as moot.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“to establish standing, a plaintiff must demonstrate (i) that he suffered an injury in fact that is concrete, particularized, and actual or imminent; (ii) that the injury was likely caused by the defendant; and (iii) that the injury would likely be redressed by judicial relief.” (slip op. at 2)

“If the plaintiff does not claim to have suffered an injury that the defendant caused and the court can remedy, there is no case or controversy for the federal court to resolve.” (slip op. at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged that defendants had emasculated men as part of a liberal agenda, brainwashed President Donald Trump, and become a public nuisance. He claimed defendants interfered with his family relations by failing to provide him with a Section 8 housing voucher under the Fair Housing Act and Americans with Disabilities Act. He sought \$45 million in damages, a housing voucher, and an injunction concerning allegedly false or defamatory statements about President Trump and former President Bill Clinton.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed the action on October 8, 2025, alleging that defendants interfered with his family and business relations and wrongfully denied him a Section 8 housing voucher under the Fair Housing Act and Americans with Disabilities Act. He also sought damages and injunctive relief concerning alleged defamatory statements about public officials. The court conducted mandatory screening, found that plaintiff failed to allege an injury traceable to defendants or redressable by the court, dismissed the complaint without prejudice, denied IFP as moot, and directed the clerk to close the case.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Lopez v. Smith, 203 F.3d 1122, 1127 (9th Cir. 2000)
- Thistle v. New Hampshire, No. 21cv02072-LL-BGS, 2022 WL 1445374, at *5 (S.D. Cal. May 6, 2022)
- Clapper v. Amnesty International USA, 568 U.S. 398, 408-09 (2013)
- Susan B. Anthony List v. Driehaus, 573 U.S. 149, 158 (2014)
- Spokeo, Inc. v. Robins, 578 U.S. 330, 338 (2016)
- TransUnion LLC v. Ramirez, 594 U.S. 413, 423 (2021)
- Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, 504 U.S. 555, 560-61 (1992)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE Case No.: 3:25-cv-2695-JES-VET
NUMBER P60005535, also known as 12 RONALD SATISH EMRIT, and ORDER: (1)
DISMISSING 13 PRESIDENTIAL COMPLAINT PURSUANT TO COMMITTEE/POLITICAL
ACTION SCREENING UNDER 28 U.S.C. 14 COMMITTEE/SEPARATE § 1915(E); AND (2)
DENYING 15 SEGREGATED FUND (SSF) NUMBER MOTION FOR LEAVE TO C00569897
d/b/a UNITED EMRITS OF PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS 16 AMERICA, AS MOOT 17
Plaintiffs, 18 v. KIM KARDASHIAN, KRIS JENNER, 19 KHLOE KARDASHIAN,
KOURTNEY 20 KARDASHIAN, ROBERT KARDASHIAN, JR., KENDALL 21 JENNER,
KYLIE JENNER, CAITLIN 22 JENNER, KANYE “YE” WEST, LAMAR ODOM, and TRAVIS
SCOTT, 23 Defendants.

24 On October 8, 2025, pro se Plaintiff Ronald Satish Emrit (“Plaintiff”) filed the 25 instant action against Defendants Kim Kardashian, Kris Jenner, Khloe Kardashian, 26 Kourtney Kardashian, Robert Kardashian, Jr., Kylie Jenner, Caitlin Jenner, Kanye “Ye” 27 West, Lamar Odom, and Travis Scott (collectively, “Defendants”), and filed a concurrent 28 1 motion to proceed in forma pauperis (“IFP”).

ECF Nos. 1, 2. For the reasons set forth 2 below, the Court DISMISSES Plaintiff’s complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) and 3 DENIES the motion to proceed IFP as moot. 4 I. BACKGROUND 5 Plaintiff alleges that Defendants have emasculated men as part of a liberal agenda 6 and have brainwashed President Donald Trump. ECF No. 1 at 6. Plaintiff claims that the 7 Kardashians and Jenners “have become a public nuisance.” Id. at 8.

Plaintiff states the 8 elements of tortious interference with business relations. Id. Plaintiff states that Defendants 9 are interfering with his family relations by not providing him with a Section 8 housing 10 voucher under the Fair Housing Act and the Americans with Disabilities Act. Id. at 9. 11 Plaintiff seeks 45 million dollars in damages, as well as injunctive relief requiring 12 Defendants to provide him with a Section 8 housing voucher and enjoining Defendants 13 from publishing false or defamatory information about President Trump or former 14 president Bill Clinton.

Id. at 9-10. 15 II. DISCUSSION 16 A. Screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a) 17 A complaint filed pursuant to the IFP provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a) is subject to 18 a mandatory and sua sponte review by the Court. *Lopez v. Smith*, 203 F.3d 1122, 1127 (9th Cir. 2000).

The Court must dismiss the complaint if it is frivolous or malicious, fails to 20 state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant 21 immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

To pass screening, all complaints 22 must contain a “short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled 23 to relief.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). 24 Plaintiff cannot proceed with his claim because he does not have standing to do so. 25 To bring suit in a federal court, a plaintiff must establish he has standing to pursue his 26 claims under Article III of the United States Constitution.

Thistle v. New Hampshire, No. 27 21cv02072-LL-BGS, 2022 WL 1445374, at *5 (S.D. Cal. May 6, 2022) (finding that pro 28 se plaintiff did not adequately allege an injury-in-fact-sufficient to establish standing) 1 (citing U.S. Const. art. III and *Clapper v. Amnesty Int’l U.S.A.*, 568 U.S. 398, 408 (2013)). 2 The burden of establishing standing falls on the plaintiff.

Susan B. Anthony List v. Driehaus, 573 U.S. 149, 158 (2014). The doctrine of standing “limits the category of 4 litigants empowered to maintain a lawsuit in federal court to seek redress for a legal 5 wrong.” *Spokeo, Inc. v. Robins*, 578 U.S. 330, 338 (2016) (citations omitted). 6 “[T]o

establish standing, a plaintiff must demonstrate (i) that he suffered an injury 7 in fact that is concrete, particularized, and actual or imminent; (ii) that the injury was likely 8 caused by the defendant; and (iii) that the injury would likely be redressed by judicial 9 relief.” *TransUnion LLC v. Ramirez*, 594 U.S. 413, 423 (2021) (citing *Lujan v. Defs. of 10 Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 560-61 (1992)). “If the plaintiff does not claim to have suffered an 11 injury that the defendant caused and the court can remedy, there is no case or controversy 12 for the federal court to resolve.” *Id.* (internal quotations and citation omitted).

Allegations 13 of potential future harm are not sufficient to establish standing. *Clapper*, 568 U.S. at 409. 14 Here, Plaintiff argues that he was wrongfully denied a Section 8 Housing voucher, 15 but does not state any facts tracing that injury to acts by any Defendant. Plaintiff does not 16 state how he individually was injured by Defendants allegedly emasculating various public 17 figures or by tortious interference with business relations.

Further, Plaintiff cannot bring 18 an action based on defamation on behalf of the President. Accordingly, Plaintiff lacks 19 standing to bring this suit. 20 B. Motion to Proceed In Forma Pauperis 21 Because Plaintiff does not have standing to sue based on the complaint, the Court 22 DENIES his motion to proceed (“IFP”) as moot. 23 // 24 // 25 // 26 // 27 // 28 // I III.

CONCLUSION 2 Accordingly, Plaintiff's complaint is DISMISSED without prejudice for lack of 3 // subject matter jurisdiction due to Plaintiffs lack of standing. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3); 4 1/28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). Plaintiff's motion to proceed IFP is DENIED as moot.

The 5 // Clerk of Court is respectfully directed to close this case. 6 IT IS SO ORDERED. 7 g // Dated: October 20, 2025 7 Se 4. 9 Honorable James E. Simmons Jr. 10 United States District Judge 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28