

FILED
United States Court of Appeals
Tenth Circuit

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

April 8, 2026

Christopher M. Wolpert
Clerk of Court

RONALD SATISH EMRIT, Former Client
of Paul Gardner, Esquire of Gardner Law
Group of Baltimore, Maryland as
Entertainment Attorney for Outkast, Mya,
Mos Def, Tommy Davidson and Salahis,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

and

SATISH DAT BEAST, Former Client of
Larry Birkhead Attorney Nancy Hass of
Hallandale Beach Florida as Family Law
Attorney; GO GO SATISH, Former Client
of Thomas Hart, Esquire of On The
Potomac of Washington, DC and Holand &
Knight, LLP and Entertainment Attorney
for Gloria Estefan and James Todd Smith
also Known as LL Cool J,

Plaintiffs,

v.

SNOOP DOGGY DOGG, Marijuana
Smoker named Calvin Broadus; SNOOP
DOGGY DOGG BOWL IN ARIZONA;
THE RACIST STATE OF ARIZONA, The
Only State Which Did not Approve of the
Holiday for the Reverend Dr. Martin
Luther King, Junior; NBC; COMCAST;
NBC UNIVERSAL; VIVENDI
UNIVERSAL; PEACOCK; UNITED
STATES OLYMPIC COMMITTEE,
USOC; MIKE TIRICO; CRIS
COLLINSWORTH; SUNDAY NIGHT

No. 26-1037
(D.C. No. 1:26-CV-00053-RTG)
(D. Colo.)

FOOTBALL; ROGER GOODELL;
NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE;
KENDRICK LAMAR; JAY-Z; DR. DRE;
ICE CUBE; ESTATE OF EAZY E ERIC
WRIGHT, Former HIV/AIDS patient;
SUPER BOWL HALFTIME SHOW; BAD
BUNNY,

Defendants - Appellees.

ORDER AND JUDGMENT*

Before **HARTZ, MATHESON, and ROSSMAN**, Circuit Judges.

Plaintiff Ronald Satish Emrit, appearing pro se, appeals the district court’s order denying him leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“*ifp*”).¹ Because he failed to explain why the district court erred, we affirm.²

Mr. Emrit filed a pro se complaint against several defendants and raising various allegations, including that the rapper Snoop Dogg is “what is wrong with

* 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 This order and judgment is not binding precedent, except under the doctrines of law of the case, res judicata, and collateral estoppel.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 Fed. R. App. P. 32.1 and 10th Cir. R. 32.1.

¹ Because Mr. Emrit appears pro se, “we liberally construe his filings, but we will not act as his advocate.” *James v. Wadas*, 724 F.3d 1312, 1315 (10th Cir. 2013).

² An order denying leave to proceed *ifp* is immediately appealable. *Lister v. Dep’t of Treasury*, 408 F.3d 1309, 1310-11 (10th Cir. 2005).

Cable Television and Network Television in addition to the National Football League.” ROA, Vol. I at 13. His complaint asked for, among other relief, \$45 million in damages and an injunction mandating that “Arizona rename the Snoop Doggy Dogg Bowl to the Martin Luther King, Junior Bowl.” *Id.* at 18. Mr. Emrit also filed an Application to Proceed in District Court Without Prepaying Fees or Costs (Long Form). The district court denied the motion and directed him to pay all filing fees to move forward with his claim.

Mr. Emrit appeals the district court’s order denying him leave to proceed *ifp*. His appellate brief, however, does not address the denial of *ifp* status. It instead discusses the merits of the underlying district court action. Aplt. Br. at 2-4.

“The first task of an appellant is 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). Mr. Emrit has failed to do so here.

Because Mr. Emrit does not present any arguments as to why the district court erred, we **AFFIRM** the denial of *ifp* status in district court and **DENY** his motion to proceed *ifp* in this appeal.

Entered for the Court

Scott M. Matheson, Jr.
Circuit Judge