

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-2376

PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE NUMBER P60005535, a/k/a Ronald Satish Emrit;
PRESIDENTIAL COMMITTEE/POLITICAL ACTION
COMMITTEE/SEPARATE SEGREGATED FUND (SSF) NUMBER C00569897,
d/b/a United Emrits of America,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE; UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE; NASA GODDARD SPACE FLIGHT
CENTER, (GSFC) in Greenbelt, Maryland; AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF
PHYSICS; KENNEDY SPACE CENTER, in Cape Canaveral, Florida; NATIONAL
SCIENCE FOUNDATION, NSF,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at
Columbia. Donald C. Coggins, Jr., District Judge. (3:25-cv-12366-DCC)

Submitted: March 12, 2026

Decided: March 17, 2026

Before WILKINSON and KING, Circuit Judges, and KEENAN, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Presidential Candidate Number P60005535, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Ronald Satish Emrit (who also identifies himself as Presidential Candidate Number P60005535) appeals the district court's order dismissing his civil complaint for improper venue. The district court referred this case to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). The magistrate judge recommended dismissal for improper venue and advised Emrit that failure to file timely, specific objections to this recommendation could waive appellate review of a district court order based upon the recommendation.

The timely filing of specific objections to a magistrate judge's recommendation is necessary to preserve appellate review of the substance of that recommendation when the parties have been warned of the consequences of noncompliance. *Martin v. Duffy*, 858 F.3d 239, 245 (4th Cir. 2017); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 846-47 (4th Cir. 1985); *see also Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 154-55 (1985). Emrit has forfeited appellate review by failing to file objections to the magistrate judge's recommendation after receiving proper notice. Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the district court.

We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED