

FILED
United States Court of Appeals
Tenth Circuit

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

October 9, 2026

Christopher M. Wolpert
Clerk of Court

RONALD SATISH EMRIT,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SABRINA CARPENTER; THE
GRAMMYS/RECORDING ACADEMY;
JUSTICE KETANJI BROWN-JACKSON;
LADY GAGA; VIVENDI UNIVERSAL;
UNIVERSAL MUSIC GROUP; NBC
UNIVERSAL; GENERAL ELECTRIC;
RCA; COMCAST; RECORDING
INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION OF
AMERICA; CARY SHERMAN,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 26-2121
(D.C. No. 1:26-CV-02067-DHU-JMR)
(D.N.M.)

ORDER AND JUDGMENT*

Before **MORITZ, BALDOCK**, and **EID**, Circuit Judges.

* After examining the brief and appellate record, this panel has determined unanimously that oral argument would not materially assist in the determination of this appeal. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); 10th Cir. R. 34.1(G). The case is therefore ordered submitted without oral argument. This order and judgment is not binding precedent, except under the doctrines of law of the case, res judicata, and collateral estoppel. But it may be cited for its persuasive value. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 32.1(a); 10th Cir. R. 32.1(A).

Ronald Satish Emrit, proceeding pro se, appeals the district court’s order dismissing his complaint without prejudice for improper venue.¹ Because his appellate brief fails to challenge the basis for the district court’s ruling, we affirm.

Emrit’s June 2026 complaint sought \$500 billion in damages for defamation, public nuisance, industrial espionage, and tortious interference with business relations from 12 music- and entertainment-related individuals and entities, including Sabrina Carpenter and The Grammy Awards.² The district court dismissed his complaint for improper venue, noting that Emrit failed to allege his claims arose from conduct in New Mexico, that any defendant resided or conducted business in New Mexico, or that personal jurisdiction existed over any defendant. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a) (directing dismissal for improper venue); *id.* § 1391(b) (providing circumstances under which venue is proper). It further declined to transfer the case to another judicial district “because the [c]omplaint d[id] not clearly indicate where venue would be proper.” R. 25; *see also* § 1406(a) (allowing transfers in the interest of justice).

¹ We construe Emrit’s pro se filings liberally. *Johnson v. Reyna*, 57 F.4th 769, 775 (10th Cir. 2023). That said, we “cannot take on the responsibility of serving as [Emrit’s] attorney in constructing arguments” on his behalf. *Garrett v. Selby Connor Maddux & Janer*, 425 F.3d 836, 840 (10th Cir. 2005).

² This is only one of Emrit’s many related cases. *See, e.g., Emrit v. Snoop Doggy Dogg*, No. 26-1037, 2026 WL 946841, at *1 (10th Cir. Apr. 8, 2026) (unpublished); *Emrit v. Grammy Awards on CBS*, No. 24-1056, 2024 WL 3839813, at *1 & n.2 (10th Cir. Aug. 16, 2024) (unpublished) (reciting district court’s finding that Emrit has repeatedly filed unsuccessful cases against the Grammys in federal court, totaling at least 19 filed in 14 states since 2023).

Emrit appeals, but his appellate brief fails to challenge any aspect of the district court’s venue ruling, instead complaining that the “Grammys are [a p]ublic [n]uisance” and arguing that his “case is not frivolous.” Apl’t. Br. 3, 4. By failing to address the basis for the district court’s ruling, Emrit has waived any challenge to it. *See Toevs v. Reid*, 685 F.3d 903, 911 (10th Cir. 2012) (explaining that “[a]rguments not clearly made in a party’s opening brief are deemed waived,” even for pro se litigants); *Emrit v. Musk*, No. 25-5015, 2025 WL 1202111, at *1 (10th Cir. Apr. 25, 2025) (unpublished) (affirming dismissal for improper venue based on Emrit’s failure to challenge district court’s ruling).³ So we affirm the dismissal for improper venue.

Entered for the Court

Nancy L. Moritz
Circuit Judge

³ We cite this unpublished case for its persuasive value. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 32.1(a); 10th Cir. R. 32.1(A).