FILED
United States Court of Appeals
Tenth Circuit

November 4, 2026

Christopher M. Wolpert
Clerk of Court

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

DIANNA GRACE REUTER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO; DELTA COUNTY; MONTROSE COUNTY,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 26-1233
(D.C. No. 1:26-CV-02426-LTB)
(D. Colo.)

ORDER AND JUDGMENT*

Before **BACHARACH**, **McHUGH**, and **CARSON**, Circuit Judges.

Plaintiff-Appellant Dianna Grace Reuter, proceeding pro se,[1] appeals the district court's dismissal of a civil action she filed in the District of Colorado against the University of Colorado and two Colorado counties. Ms. Reuter is subject to filing

---

* After examining the briefs 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 This order and judgment is not binding precedent, except under the doctrines of law of the case, res judicata, and collateral estoppel. It may be cited, however, for its persuasive value consistent with Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 32.1 and Tenth Circuit Rule 32.1.

[1] "Because [Ms. Reuter] is proceeding pro se on appeal, we liberally construe her filings, but we do not act as her advocate." *Luo v. Wang*, 71 F.4th 1289, 1291 n.1 (10th Cir. 2023).

restrictions in the District of Colorado, which require her to obtain the court's permission before filing new pro se complaints. *See, e.g.*, *Reuter v. San Juan Mountains Credit Union*, Nos. 25-1442, 26-1022, 26-1181, 2026 WL 2445381, at *1 (10th Cir. Aug. 20, 2026). Because Ms. Reuter did not comply with these filing restrictions, the district court dismissed her Complaint. Exercising jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291, we affirm.

In May 2025, the District of Colorado determined that Ms. Reuter's "abusive history of filing actions demonstrates that imposition of filing restrictions is appropriate." Order Dismissing Action & Imposing Filing Restrictions at 4, *Reuter v. City of Boston*, No. 25-cv-0405-LTB (D. Colo. May 6, 2025), Dkt. No. 6. These filing restrictions prohibit Ms. Reuter from filing pro se actions in the District of Colorado without permission. *Id.* at 4–5. Before Ms. Reuter may proceed pro se, she must file a motion requesting leave to file a pro se action with the proposed Complaint attached. *Id.* at 5. Her motion must include: (1) a list of Ms. Reuter's pending and previously filed lawsuits in the District of Colorado, (2) a "statement of the legal issues to be raised in the proposed new pleading and whether she has raised the same issues in other proceedings in the District of Colorado," and (3) a notarized affidavit certifying that, among other things, "the legal arguments being raised are not frivolous or made in bad faith." *Id.* at 4–5.

In June 2026, Ms. Reuter filed a Complaint and a motion requesting leave to file a pro se action in the District of Colorado. Her Complaint includes various allegations about events that happened at the University of Colorado in the 1970s and

80s and incidents that occurred during her employment at two Colorado school districts between 2003 and 2022. The district court concluded that Ms. Reuter's Complaint was "comprised of claims and allegations which are nonsensical and frivolous." ROA at 31. So, it denied her motion to proceed pro se and dismissed her Complaint for failure to comply with filing restrictions.

We review a district court's application of a previously imposed filing restriction for abuse of discretion. *See In re Peterson*, 338 F. App'x 763, 764 (10th Cir. 2009) (unpublished).[2] Ms. Reuter's opening brief fails to advance any nonfrivolous argument challenging the district court's ruling that she failed to comply with its filing restrictions. Instead, Ms. Reuter makes general assertions that she has a right to access the courts and that her rights are being violated. But "the right of access to the courts is neither absolute nor unconditional, and there is no constitutional right of access to the courts to prosecute an action that is frivolous or malicious." *Tripati v. Beaman*, 878 F.2d 351, 353 (10th Cir. 1989) (citation omitted); *see also San Juan Mountains Credit Union*, 2026 WL 2445381, at *2 (dismissing a different appeal brought by Ms. Reuter for the same reason). Accordingly, Ms. Reuter has not met her "first task" as an appellant: "to explain to us why the district court's decision was wrong." *Nixon v. City & Cnty. of Denver*, 784 F.3d 1364, 1366 (10th Cir. 2015).

[2] We cite unpublished cases for their persuasive value only and do not treat them as binding authority. *See United States v. Ellis*, 23 F.4th 1228, 1238 n.6 (10th Cir. 2022).

Nor do we construe Ms. Reuter's brief as a challenge to her filing restrictions. As we have previously noted, Ms. Reuter "did not appeal when the district court entered the restrictions, and we lack jurisdiction to review them now." *San Juan Mountains Credit Union*, 2026 WL 2445381, at *1 n.2; *see also Bowles v. Russell*, 551 U.S. 205, 214 (2007) ("[T]he timely filing of a notice of appeal in a civil case is a jurisdictional requirement.").

We therefore AFFIRM the district court's order dismissing this action.

Entered for the Court

Carolyn B. McHugh
Circuit Judge