

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-1354

RONALD SATISH EMRIT,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

AMERICAN COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK, INC.,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle
District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. Thomas D. Schroeder,
District Judge. (1:13-cv-00776-TDS-LPA)

Submitted: August 27, 2014

Decided: September 2, 2014

Before KING, DUNCAN, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Ronald Satish Emrit, Appellant Pro Se. Mark A. Stafford, NELSON
MULLINS RILEY & SCARBOROUGH, LLP, Winston-Salem, North Carolina,
for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Ronald Satish Emrit appeals the district court's order dismissing his civil action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. We have reviewed the record and the parties' informal briefs on appeal, and we conclude that this appeal is frivolous. See Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989); Emrit v. Am. Commc'ns Network, Inc., No. 1:13-cv-00776-TDS-LPA (M.D.N.C. Apr. 2, 2014); see also 4th Cir. R. 34(b) (limiting appellate review to issues raised in informal brief). Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) (2012).

Additionally, we have considered Appellee's request for sanctions against Emrit. We decline to impose the requested prefiling injunction or similar "gateway" order at this juncture. See Cromer v. Kraft Foods N. Am., Inc., 390 F.3d 812, 817-18 (4th Cir. 2004) (discussing prefiling injunction and relevant factors). However, Emrit is hereby warned that federal courts, including this court, are authorized to impose sanctions upon vexatious and repetitive litigants for frivolous filings. See Foley v. Fix, 106 F.3d 556, 558 (4th Cir. 1997). Further frivolous filings by Emrit may result in this court sanctioning him, including by ordering a prefiling injunction that limits his access to the 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.

DISMISSED