

FILED
United States Court of Appeals
Tenth Circuit

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

September 11, 2026

Christopher M. Wolpert
Clerk of Court

ADAM STREGE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

GRAND JUNCTION POLICE
DEPARTMENT; CITY GRAND
JUNCTION; POLICE OFFICER NATE
LONG, in his individual and official
capacity,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 26-1174
(D.C. No. 1:26-CV-01033-LTB)
(D. Colo.)

ORDER AND JUDGMENT*

Before **PHILLIPS, KELLY**, and **FEDERICO**, Circuit Judges.**

Plaintiff-Appellant Adam Strege initially filed suit against Defendants-Appellees Grand Junction Police Department, the City of Grand Junction, and Officer Nate Long in state court. R. 6–7. Two of the defendants removed the case to federal court. *Id.* at 6. The district court summarily remanded the case to state court. Order

* This order and judgment is not binding precedent, except under the doctrines of law of the case, res judicata, and collateral estoppel.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.

** 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.

for Summ. Remand, Strege v. Grand Junction Police Dep't, No. 1:26-cv-01033 (D. Colo. Mar. 16, 2026) (ECF No. 9). Before the court is Mr. Strege's pro se appeal of the district court's denial of two motions to reconsider that remand and his motion to consolidate this case with other district court cases. Also before this court is a pending "Motion [for] Leave to Correct Clerical Mistake" and a pending motion to proceed in forma pauperis (IFP) on appeal.

We review the district court's determination that the case was moot de novo. Mukhtar v. Lambrecht, 172 F.4th 836, 841 (10th Cir. 2026). We construe Mr. Strege's pro se arguments liberally but do not act as an advocate. United States v. Pinson, 584 F.3d 972, 975 (10th Cir. 2009). Mr. Strege's brief is devoid of any colorable argument based in fact or law, instead consisting of 80 pages of mostly incomprehensible arguments. Our review of the record shows that the district court correctly determined that the remand order rendered the case moot. Because Mr. Strege has not advanced a rational argument on the law or facts, we will deny his motion to proceed IFP. See DeBardeleben v. Quinlan, 937 F.2d 502, 505 (10th Cir. 1991) (requiring a reasoned, non-frivolous argument). We will also deny his other pending motion because it arises in another appeal (No. 26-1026).

AFFIRMED. All pending motions are denied.

Entered for the Court

Paul J. Kelly, Jr.
Circuit Judge