

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

OPINION

Kardashian

PER CURIAM.

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 19 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. 3 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