

**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

OPINION

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, Volodymyr 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