

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Moon v. Mazzuchelli

Moon · No. Civil Action No. 1:26-cv-00793 (UNA) · Decided May 8, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Columbia grants the 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 complaint's allegations of an expansive criminal conspiracy and related wrongdoing are irrational, wholly incredible, and insufficient to support 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-00793 (UNA)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	On initial review of a pro se complaint and an application to proceed in forma pauperis, the district court granted in forma pauperis status and dismissed the action as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	On initial review under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i), the court determines whether an in forma pauperis complaint is frivolous or malicious and whether it states a plausible claim for relief.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published district court memorandum opinion; no reporter citation appears in the opinion text.
PARTIES	Adrian Damico Moon v. Andrew Paul Mazzuchelli

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- pleadings
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- federal jurisdiction
- in forma pauperis litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint should be dismissed on initial review as frivolous or malicious under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).
2. Whether allegations that are irrational, wholly incredible, fanciful, or plainly abusive of the judicial process can support a federal claim or invoke subject matter jurisdiction.

HOLDINGS

1. A complaint must be dismissed as frivolous when its allegations lack an arguable basis in law or fact, are irrational or wholly incredible, or postulate wholly fanciful events; a complaint plainly abusive of the judicial process is also properly treated as malicious. Moon's complaint fell into both categories.
2. Federal courts lack power to entertain claims that are otherwise within their jurisdiction when they are so attenuated and unsubstantial as to be absolutely devoid of merit.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A complaint that lacks “an arguable basis either in law or in fact” is frivolous”

“a “complaint plainly abusive of the judicial process is properly typed malicious,””

“when the facts alleged rise to the level of the irrational or the wholly incredible,”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Moon sued Mazzuchelli, alleging that the defendant, judges, and numerous other entities or beings had engaged in an evil criminal conspiracy to dismiss his federal lawsuits and deny him opportunities to intervene in other cases. The complaint also alleged domestic terrorism and other unspecified wrongdoing causing Moon to fear for his safety. The pleading was largely incomprehensible and consisted in substantial part of sweeping religious proclamations.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a pro se complaint and an application for leave to proceed in forma pauperis. The district court granted the application, reviewed the complaint sua sponte, and dismissed the case as frivolous because the allegations were rambling, largely incomprehensible, irrational, and abusive of the judicial process.

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)
- 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)
- Newburyport Water Co. v. Newburyport, 193 U.S. 561, 579 (1904)

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ADRIAN DAMICO MOON,)) Plaintiff,)) v.) Civil Action No. 1:26-cv-00793 (UNA)) ANDREW PAUL MAZZUCHELLI,)) 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, alleging that he, and many others—including judges and "Satan, a spiritual being, a.k.a 'Lucifer da fallen loser'"—have engaged in an "evil, vicious, heinous" criminal conspiracy against him to dismiss his federal lawsuits and to deny him the opportunity to intervene in other federal cases, and have also allegedly committed myriad other crimes and wrongdoing, including, but not limited to, "domestic terrorism," and other nefarious actions that cause him to fear for his safety.

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 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