

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Ronald Satish Smith v. Bill Gates, et al.

Smith v. Gates · No. 25-cv-3641-AGS-AHG · Decided January 27, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of California grants Ronald Satish Smith's motion to proceed in forma pauperis. The court dismisses his complaint without prejudice for lack of Article III standing, granting leave to amend by February 27, 2026.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
DECIDED	January 27, 2026
DOCKET	25-cv-3641-AGS-AHG
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved to proceed in forma pauperis. The district court granted the motion, screened the complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), and dismissed the complaint for lack of Article III standing, without prejudice and with leave to amend.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The complaint was screened under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) and was subject to dismissal if frivolous or if it failed to state a claim. Article III standing requires a concrete and particularized injury in fact.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished, nonprecedential district court order
PARTIES	Ronald Satish Smith v. Bill Gates, et al.

TOPICS

- standing
- civil procedure
- injunctions
- declaratory judgment
- remedies

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- constitutional law
- remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Smith qualified to proceed in forma pauperis.
2. Whether Smith had Article III standing to pursue his claims.
3. Whether the complaint should be dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

HOLDINGS

1. Smith could proceed in forma pauperis because he had no assets and his disability payments barely exceeded his expenses.
2. Smith lacked Article III standing because he did not allege a concrete and particularized injury in fact caused by the defendants.
3. The complaint was subject to dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) because Smith lacked standing.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“To have standing, a plaintiff “must have suffered” a “concrete and particularized” “injury in fact.”” (1)

“Smith’s IFP request is GRANTED, and his complaint is DISMISSED without prejudice and with leave to amend.” (1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Smith alleged that the defendants committed industrial espionage and read the minds of and spied on consumers. He sought \$500 billion, an injunction, and declaratory relief. The court found that he did not allege ownership or consumption of any defendants' products or otherwise allege that he was the subject of the claimed misconduct.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Smith filed a complaint seeking \$500 billion, an injunction, and declaratory relief against Bill Gates, corporations, corporate leaders, and other defendants. He moved to proceed in forma pauperis. The court granted that motion but dismissed the complaint during statutory screening because Smith did not allege an injury in fact or that he was the subject of the alleged conduct.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Rodriguez v. Cook, 169 F.3d 1176, 1177 (9th Cir. 1999)
- Blount v. Saul, No. 21-CV-0679-BLM, 2021 WL 1561453, at *1 (S.D. Cal. Apr. 21, 2021)
- Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, 504 U.S. 555, 560 (1992)

OPINION

Gates

PER CURIAM.

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

2 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

3 Ronald Satish SMITH, Case No.: 25-cv-3641-AGS-AHG 4 Plaintiff,

ORDER GRANTING IFP MOTION

5 v. (ECF 2) AND DISMISSING

COMPLAINT

6 Bill GATES, et al., 7 Defendants. 8 Plaintiff Ronald Smith moves to proceed without paying the usual \$405 in court 9 fees. See *Rodriguez v. Cook*, 169 F.3d 1176, 1177 (9th Cir. 1999) (“An action may proceed 10 despite failure to pay the filing fees only if the party is granted IFP [in forma pauperis] 11 status.”); 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a) (“filing fee of \$350”); Judicial Conference Schedule of Fees, 12 District Court Misc. Fee Schedule, § 14 (eff. Dec. 1, 2023) (“Administrative fee” of “\$55”). 13 Smith has no assets, and his disability payments hardly exceed his expenses (see ECF 2), 14 so he need not pay the filing fees. See *Blount v. Saul*, No. 21-CV-0679-BLM, 2021 WL 15 1561453, at *1 (S.D. Cal. Apr. 21, 2021) (“[A] party need not be completely destitute to 16 proceed IFP.”). 17 Next, the Court must screen the complaint and dismiss it if it is “frivolous” or “fails 18 to state a claim.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). Smith seeks “500 billion dollars” from—and 19 “an injunction and/or declaratory judgment” against—the defendant corporations and 20 corporate leaders, “The Mythical Bavarian Illuminati as Urban Legend,” Pope Leo XIV, 21 and others. But he does not have Article III standing to sue. To have standing, a plaintiff 22 “must have suffered” a “concrete and particularized” “injury in fact.” *Lujan v. Defenders 23 of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 560 (1992). Smith alleges that defendants “have committed 24 industrial espionage” and both “read the minds of” and “spy on” consumers. (ECF 1, at 25 8–9.) But he does not allege that he owns or has consumed any of defendants’ products or 26 that he has otherwise been the alleged misbehavior’s subject. So, he lacks standing. 27 Smith’s IFP request is GRANTED, and his complaint is DISMISSED without 28 1 || prejudice and with leave to amend. Any amended complaint is due February 27, 2026. 2 Dated: January 27, 2026 4 Hon. Andrew G. Schopler 5 United States District Judge 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28