

FILED

United States Court of Appeals
Tenth Circuit

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

August 26, 2019

Elisabeth A. Shumaker
Clerk of Court

RYAN ANDERSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

JASON POLLARD,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 19-5044
(D.C. No. 4:18-CV-00582-GKF-FHM)
(N.D. Okla.)

ORDER AND JUDGMENT*

Before **MATHESON, MCKAY, and BACHARACH**, Circuit Judges.

This appeal grew out of an estranged friendship between Ryan Anderson and Jason Pollard. After Mr. Pollard and his wife (Ms. Betsy Knapp) divorced, Mr. Anderson wanted to contact Ms. Knapp and try to pursue a relationship with her. But Mr. Pollard stopped responding to Mr. Anderson's frequent messages and did not connect Mr. Anderson with Ms.

* Oral argument would not materially help us to decide this appeal. So we have decided the appeal based on the appellate briefs and the record on appeal. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); 10th Cir. R. 34.1(G).

This order and judgment does not constitute binding precedent except under the doctrines of law of the case, res judicata, and collateral estoppel. But the order and judgment may be cited for its persuasive value if otherwise appropriate. Fed. R. App. P. 32.1(a); 10th Cir. R. 32.1(A).

Knapp. Based on this refusal to respond, Mr. Anderson (acting *pro se*) sued Mr. Pollard for “intentional emotional abuse.”¹ R. at 4.

The district court dismissed this cause of action, thoroughly explaining why Mr. Anderson’s allegations do not state a valid claim for relief. We agree with the district court’s explanation and affirm the dismissal.

Entered for the Court

Robert E. Bacharach
Circuit Judge

¹ In the complaint, Mr. Anderson also asserted claims for “money laundering/tax evasion” and “opportunity loss and lowering quality of life,” which the district court dismissed for failure to state a claim for relief. R. at 4. We are not sure whether Mr. Anderson is appealing the dismissal of these claims. In several places, Mr. Anderson accuses Mr. Pollard of money laundering and tax evasion. But Mr. Anderson does not respond to the district court’s determination that no private right of action exists for money laundering or tax evasion. *Id.* at 57. And, as the district court further explained, there is no separate cause of action for “lowering quality of life” or “opportunity loss.” *Id.* at 55–57. The court liberally construed these claims as causes of action for negligence or tortious interference with business relations. *Id.* Mr. Anderson does not respond to this construction of the claims. But he does repeatedly assert that he is entitled to money damages, so we liberally construe his argument as a request for damages incurred from “intentional emotional abuse.”