

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MONTANA,
MISSOULA DIVISION

**Presidential Candidate Number P60005535, aka Ronald Satish Emrit
& Presidential Committee/Political Action Committee/Separate
Segregated Fund (SSF) Number C00569897 d/b/a United Emrits of
America v. Erin Burnett et al.**

CV 25-189-M-WWM · No. CV 25-189-M-WWM; 9:25-cv-00189 · Decided January 21, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Montana adopted a magistrate judge’s findings and recommendation and dismissed Ronald Satish Emrit’s complaint without leave to amend as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). The court found no clear error because the plaintiff did not object to the findings and recommendation. The court also certified that any appeal would not be taken in good faith and directed entry of judgment.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Montana, Missoula Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	William W. Mercer
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Montana, Missoula Division
DECIDED	January 21, 2026
DOCKET	CV 25-189-M-WWM; 9:25-cv-00189
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff proceeding in forma pauperis lodged a complaint. A magistrate judge recommended dismissal as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) without leave to amend and certification that any appeal would not be taken in good faith. The district court reviewed the unobjected-to findings and recommendation for clear error, adopted them in full, dismissed the complaint without prejudice and without leave to amend, and directed entry of judgment.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	When no objections are filed to a magistrate judge's findings and recommendation, the district court reviews the recommendation for

	clear error rather than conducting de novo review.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Presidential Candidate Number P60005535, aka Ronald Satish Emrit, Presidential Committee/Political Action Committee/Separate Segregated Fund (SSF) Number C00569897 d/b/a United Emrits of America v. Erin Burnett, Outfront of Cable News Network (CNN), Perhaps “Madame President”, The Hypothetical Erin Burnett for President 2028 Campaign, Volodymyr Zelenskyy, Estate of Alexei Navalny, Maria Cherniavska, Darya Ignateva, Kateryna Olokoba, International Court of Justice of the Hague, Rachel Barreiro Garcia, Estate of Ruth Bader Ginsberg, Sabine Aisha Jules, Yanick Rachel Emrit, Edna Carrasco, Ana Gomez, Alina Alvarez, Marena Linares

TOPICS

motions to dismiss

standard of review

appellate procedure

civil procedure

pleadings

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

federal courts

in forma pauperis screening

appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should review the magistrate judge's findings and recommendation de novo or for clear error when plaintiff filed no objections.
2. Whether the magistrate judge's recommendation to dismiss the in forma pauperis complaint as frivolous without leave to amend should be adopted.
3. Whether an appeal from the dismissal should be certified as not taken in good faith.

HOLDINGS

1. Because plaintiff filed no objections, he was not entitled to de novo review, and the district court reviewed the findings and recommendation for clear error.
2. The district court adopted the recommendation to dismiss plaintiff's complaint as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2), without leave to amend.
3. Any appeal from the disposition would not be taken in good faith.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Clear error exists if the Court is left with a “definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed.””

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff Ronald Satish Emrit lodged a complaint against numerous defendants, including Erin Burnett, media-related entities, public officials, estates, and individuals located in various countries. He proceeded in forma pauperis. The magistrate judge recommended dismissal of the complaint as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2), and plaintiff did not object.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed his complaint on November 6, 2025, and proceeded in forma pauperis. Magistrate Judge Kathleen L. DeSoto issued findings and recommendations on November 25, 2025, recommending dismissal without leave to amend as frivolous and certification under Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 24(a)(4)(B). Plaintiff filed no objections. The district court found no clear error, adopted the findings and recommendation, dismissed the complaint under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b), and ordered entry of a separate judgment under Rule 58.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003)
- McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore Bus. Mach. Inc., 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981)
- United States v. Syrax, 235 F.3d 422, 427 (9th Cir. 2000)

OPINION

Emrit

PER CURIAM.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF MONTANA

MISSOULA DIVISION

Presidential Candidate Number

P60005535, aka RONALD SATISH CV 25-189-M-WWM

EMRIT & Presidential Committee/Political Action Committee/Separate Segregated Fund ORDER
ADOPTING FINDINGS (SSF) Number C00569897 d/b/a AND RECOMMENDATION AND
United Emrits of America, DISMISSING WITHOUT
PREJUDICE

Plaintiff, VS. ERIN BURNETT Outfront of Cable News Network (CNN) Perhaps “Madame President,” The Hypothetical Erin Burnett for President 2028 Campaign, Volodomyr Zelenskyy (President of Ukraine), Estate of Alexei Navalny, Maria Cherniavska of Warsaw, Poland, Darya Ignateva of Kyiv, Ukraine, Kateryna Olokoba of Kherson, Ukraine, International Court of Justice of the Hague, Netherlands, Rachel Barreiro Garcia (RBG) of Madrid, Spain, Estate of Ruth Bader Ginsberg (RBG), Sabine Aisha Jules of Fort Lauderdale, Florida, Yanick Rachel Emrit, Edna

Carrasco of Panama City, Panama, Ana Gomez of Medellin, Colombia, Alina Alvarez of Madrid, Spain, Marena Linares of Tenerife in the Canary Islands, Defendants. Plaintiff Ronald Satish Emrit (“Emrit”) lodged a Complaint against the above-named Defendants on November 6, 2025. (Doc. 2). Because Emrit is proceeding in forma pauperis (Docs. I, 3), the Court must review his complaint to determine if the allegations are frivolous or malicious, fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seek monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). Judge DeSoto made Findings and Recommendations in this matter on November 25, 2025. (Doc. 3). Plaintiff did not object and, therefore, is not entitled to de novo review of the record. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003). This Court reviews the Findings and Recommendation for clear error. *McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore Bus. Mach. Inc.*, 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981). Clear error exists if the Court is left with a “definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed.” *United States v. Syrax*, 235 F.3d 422, 427 (9th Cir. 2000). Judge DeSoto recommended that this Court dismiss Plaintiff’s Complaint (Doc. 2) without leave to amend, as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). (Doc. 3 at 8). Judge DeSoto further recommended that this Court certify that any appeals from this disposition would not be taken in good faith, pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 24(a)(4)(B). (Id. at 9). The Court finds no clear error in Judge DeSoto’s Findings and Recommendation (Doc. 3). Accordingly: IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Judge DeSoto’s Findings and Recommendation are ADOPTED IN FULL. Therefore, IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Complaint (Doc. 2) is DISMISSED without leave to amend, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b). IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that any appeal from this disposition would not be taken in good faith pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 24(a)(4)(B). The Clerk of Court is directed to notify the parties of the making of this Order and to enter, by separate document, a judgment of dismissal pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 58. DATED this 20th day of January, 2026. ZMew
WILLIAMW.MERCER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE