

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Moon v. Cislak

Civil Action No. 1:26-cv-00682 (UNA) (D.D.C. May 8, 2026) · No. Civil Action No. 1:26-cv-00682 (UNA) ·
Decided May 8, 2026

SUMMARY

The U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia grants the pro se plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis but dismisses the complaint as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i). The court concludes that the rambling allegations of an expansive conspiracy and various criminal acts are both legally and factually insubstantial and lack a plausible basis for federal 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	May 8, 2026
DOCKET	Civil Action No. 1:26-cv-00682 (UNA)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Initial judicial review of a pro se complaint and application to proceed in forma pauperis.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	On initial review of an in forma pauperis complaint, the court determines whether the complaint is frivolous, malicious, or otherwise subject to dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i). A complaint must contain sufficient factual matter to state a plausible claim, and claims lacking an arguable basis in law or fact may be dismissed as frivolous.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published district court memorandum opinion; persuasive authority within the District of Columbia and nonprecedential outside the issuing court.
PARTIES	Adrian Damico Moon v. Clifton Cislak

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- pleadings
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil procedure

Federal courts

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint was frivolous or malicious and therefore subject to dismissal on initial review under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).
2. Whether the allegations were so irrational, wholly incredible, attenuated, and unsubstantial that the court could not exercise subject matter jurisdiction over the action.

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint was frivolous and malicious because it lacked an arguable basis in law or fact and was plainly abusive of the judicial process; the action therefore had to be dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).
2. The court could not exercise subject matter jurisdiction over claims that were so attenuated and unsubstantial as to be absolutely devoid of merit.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to ‘state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.’” (556 U.S. at 678)

“when the facts alleged rise to the level of the irrational or the wholly incredible” (504 U.S. at 33)

“so attenuated and unsubstantial as to be absolutely devoid of merit.” (415 U.S. at 536-37)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff filed a rambling and largely incomprehensible pro se complaint against Clifton Cislak, identified as the Clerk of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, along with allegations concerning judges and other purported participants. The complaint alleged an elaborate criminal conspiracy to dispose of plaintiff's cases and rule against him, as well as murder, theft, false arrest, stalking, domestic terrorism, and other wrongdoing. The pleading also contained sweeping religious proclamations.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a pro se complaint and an application for leave to proceed in forma pauperis. On initial review, the court granted the in forma pauperis application and dismissed the action as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

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)
- Crisafi v. Holland, 655 F.2d 1305, 1307-09 (D.C. Cir. 1981)
- 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)
- Ibrahim v. Dist. of Columbia, Nos. 93-0002, Civ. A. 93-0060, 1993 WL 30814, at *1 (D.D.C. Jan. 29, 1993)
- Ibrahim v. D.C. Dep't of Corrections, No. 93-7029, 1993 WL 328110 (D.C. Cir. July 7, 1993) (per curiam)

OPINION

Moon v. Cislak

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ADRIAN DAMICO MOON,)

) Plaintiff,)) v.) Civil Action No. 1:26-cv-00682 (UNA))

CLIFTON CISLAK,)

) Defendant.)

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the court on its initial review of Plaintiff's pro se Complaint, ECF No. 1, and Application for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis, ECF No. 2. The court grants the in forma pauperis Application, and for the reasons discussed below, dismisses this matter as frivolous. Plaintiff's Complaint is rambling and largely incomprehensible. He sues a single Defendant, the Clerk of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and many others— including several judges and “Satan, Lucifer da fallen loser”—alleging that they have engaged in an “evil, vicious, heinous” criminal conspiracy against him to dispose of his cases, rule unfavorably, enter injunctions against him, and they have also committed myriad other crimes and wrongdoing, including, but not limited to, murder, theft, destruction, false arrest, stalking, and domestic terrorism. The remainder of the pleading consists of sweeping religious proclamations. “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 a “complaint plainly abusive of the judicial process is properly typed malicious,” Crisafi v. Holland, 655 F.2d 1305, 1309 (D.C. Cir. 1981). The instant Complaint falls into both categories; accordingly, the court cannot exercise subject matter jurisdiction over it. See 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) (examining cases dismissed “for patent insubstantiality,” including where the plaintiff allegedly “was subjected to a campaign of surveillance and harassment.”). As here, a court shall dismiss a complaint as frivolous “when 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*, 655 F.2d at 1307–08 (D.C. Cir. 1981); see also *Ibrahim v. Dist. of Columbia*, Nos. 93–0002, Civ. A. 93–0060, 1993 WL 30814, at *1 (D.D.C. Jan. 29, 1993) (finding the plaintiff’s “assertion that . . . matters were decided against him because the Courts conspired” against him was frivolous where the “facts only support the notion that the Judges in . . . those cases diligently worked on his complaints [but] decided them against him”), appeal dismissed sub nom. *Ibrahim v. D.C. Dep’t of Corrections*, No. 93-7029, 1993 WL 328110 (D.C. Cir. July 7, 1993) (per curiam) (finding no basis for appeal). For all of the foregoing reasons, the Complaint, ECF No. 1, and this case, are dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i). A separate Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

DATE: May 8, 2026 /s/ CHRISTOPHER R. COOPER
United States District Judge