

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 17-1471

RONALD SATISH EMRIT,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CONGRESSMAN CRESCENT HARDY,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt.
Paul W. Grimm, District Judge. (8:17-cv-00075-PWG)

Submitted: June 20, 2017

Decided: June 30, 2017

Before MOTZ, THACKER, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Ronald Satish Emrit, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Ronald Satish Emrit appeals the district court's order dismissing his civil complaint for improper venue. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. *See Buchanan v. Manley*, 145 F.3d 386, 388-89 (D.C. Cir. 1998). It is apparent from Emrit's complaint that no conceivable basis exists for venue in the District of Maryland. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), (c) (2012) (describing venue and residency requirements); *O'Neill v. Battisti*, 472 F.2d 789, 791 (6th Cir. 1972) (describing "residency" of public official). Moreover, we are satisfied that the interests of justice did not require transferring, rather than dismissing, the action. *See Simpkins v. D.C. Gov't*, 108 F.3d 366, 370 (D.C. Cir. 1997) (recognizing that district court may dismiss action, despite improper venue, where complaint patently failed to state viable claim).

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment. 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