

FILED

United States Court of Appeals
Tenth Circuit

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

November 30, 2021

Christopher M. Wolpert
Clerk of Court

HUNTER ADAM MELNICK,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

JOHN CAMPER, Director of Colorado
Bureau of Investigation, in his official
capacity,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 20-1417
(D.C. No. 1:18-CV-02885-CMA-KLM)
(D. Colo.)

ORDER AND JUDGMENT*

Before **MATHESON, BRISCOE**, and **PHILLIPS**, Circuit Judges.

Hunter Melnick is a convicted sex offender who challenges the constitutionality of Colorado’s Sex Offender Registration Act (“CSORA”) on several grounds. The district court, in a thorough and well-reasoned opinion applying Supreme Court and circuit precedent, dismissed Melnick’s complaint for failure to state a claim under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). As the district court

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 This order and judgment is not binding precedent, except under the doctrines of law of the case, res judicata, and collateral estoppel.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

explained, many of Melnick's allegations stem from a misreading of CSORA.

Melnick appeals that dismissal pro se and raises nearly all the same arguments he raised in the district court. Yet, none of Melnick's arguments point us to legal errors warranting reversal.¹ So, upon review of the record de novo and exercising jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291, we affirm the judgment for substantially the same reasons stated by the district court.²

Entered for the Court

Gregory A. Phillips
Circuit Judge

¹ As a pro se litigant, we must liberally construe Melnick's pleadings, *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007), without acting as his advocate, *Hall v. Bellmon*, 935 F.2d 1106, 1110 (10th Cir. 1991).

² We also deny Melnick's motion to supplement the record.