

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mallgren v. United States, et al.

Mallgren · No. Civil Action No. 26-1717 (UNA) · Decided June 1, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Columbia granted Anthony Brian Mallgren's application to proceed in forma pauperis and dismissed his pro se complaint. The court concluded that the complaint's unintelligible allegations were irrational and incredible, rendering it frivolous and depriving the court of subject-matter jurisdiction.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Columbia
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Christopher R. Cooper
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Columbia
DECIDED	June 1, 2026
DOCKET	Civil Action No. 26-1717 (UNA)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The plaintiff filed a pro se complaint and an application to proceed in forma pauperis. The district court granted in forma pauperis status and dismissed the complaint as frivolous for lack of an arguable legal or factual basis and lack of subject matter jurisdiction.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	published
PARTIES	Anthony Brian Mallgren v. United States, et al.

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- pleadings
- civil procedure
- motions to dismiss

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- federal jurisdiction
- pleading
- in forma pauperis

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the plaintiff should be permitted to proceed in forma pauperis.

2. Whether the pro se complaint should be dismissed as frivolous because its allegations lacked an arguable basis in law or fact and were irrational or wholly incredible.
3. Whether a federal court may exercise subject matter jurisdiction over a frivolous complaint.

HOLDINGS

1. The court granted the plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis.
2. A complaint must be dismissed as frivolous when its allegations are irrational or wholly incredible and therefore lack an arguable basis in law or fact. The plaintiff's complaint met that standard because its allegations were unintelligible and, insofar as they could be understood, irrational and incredible.
3. The court cannot exercise subject matter jurisdiction over a frivolous complaint.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"A complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to 'state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.'" (at 1)

"A complaint that lacks "an arguable basis either in law or in fact" is frivolous" (at 1)

"the federal courts are without power to entertain claims otherwise within their jurisdiction if they are 'so attenuated and unsubstantial as to be absolutely devoid of merit.'" (at 1)

"the facts alleged rise to the level of the irrational or the wholly incredible" (at 1)

"postulat[e] events and circumstances of a wholly fanciful kind" (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The plaintiff proceeded pro se and submitted a complaint containing only a few factual allegations. The allegations were unintelligible and, to the extent they could be understood, were irrational and incredible. The court therefore characterized the complaint as frivolous.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The action was initiated in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia by a pro se complaint and an application to proceed in forma pauperis. The court granted the application and dismissed the complaint, stating that a separate order would issue.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)
- Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)
- Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989)

- Hagans v. Lavine, 415 U.S. 528, 536-37 (1974)
- Newburyport Water Co. v. Newburyport, 193 U.S. 561, 579 (1904)
- Tooley v. Napolitano, 586 F.3d 1006, 1010 (D.C. Cir. 2009)
- Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 33 (1992)
- Crisafi v. Holland, 655 F.2d 1305, 1307-08 (D.C. Cir. 1981)

OPINION

Mallgren v. United States of America

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ANTHONY BRIAN MALLGREN,)

) Plaintiff,) v.) Civil Action No. 26-1717 (UNA))) UNITED STATES, et al.,)) Defendants.)

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on the plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis, ECF No. 2, and pro se complaint, ECF No. 1. The Court grants the application and dismisses the complaint. "A complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to 'state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.'" *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)). A complaint that lacks "an arguable basis either in law or in fact" is frivolous, *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989), and the Court cannot exercise subject matter jurisdiction over a frivolous complaint, *Hagans v. Lavine*, 415 U.S. 528, 536-37 (1974) ("Over the years, this Court has repeatedly held that the federal courts are without power to entertain claims otherwise within their jurisdiction if they are 'so attenuated and unsubstantial as to be absolutely devoid of merit.'" (quoting *Newburyport Water Co. v. Newburyport*, 193 U.S. 561, 579 (1904))); *Tooley v. Napolitano*, 586 F.3d 1006, 1010 (D.C. Cir. 2009). Consequently, the Court is obligated to dismiss a complaint as frivolous when, as here, "the facts alleged rise to the level of the irrational or the wholly incredible," *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 33 (1992), or "postulat[e] events and circumstances of a wholly fanciful kind," *Crisafi v. Holland*, 655 F.2d 1305, 1307-08 (D.C. Cir. 1981). 1 The complaint's few factual allegations are unintelligible, and to the extent they can be understood, the Court deems them irrational and incredible, rendering the complaint frivolous. And the Court cannot exercise jurisdiction of a frivolous complaint. An Order will be issued separately. DATE: June 1, 2026 /s/

CHRISTOPHER R. COOPER

United States District Judge 2