

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Moon v. Van Zile

Moon · No. Civil Action No. 26-00891 (UNA) · Decided April 30, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States 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 complaint's allegations lack an arguable basis in law or fact and are fanciful.

CASE DETAILS

|                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| COURT                 | United States District Court for the District of Columbia                                                                                                                                                                       |
| WRITING FOR THE COURT | Rudolph Contreras                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| JURISDICTION          | United States District Court for the District of Columbia                                                                                                                                                                       |
| DECIDED               | April 30, 2026                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| DOCKET                | Civil Action No. 26-00891 (UNA)                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| DISPOSITION           | dismissed                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| PROCEDURAL POSTURE    | Plaintiff, proceeding pro se, filed a complaint seeking a temporary restraining order and an application to proceed in forma pauperis. The district court granted the IFP application and dismissed the complaint as frivolous. |
| STANDARD OF REVIEW    | The complaint was screened under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) to determine whether it was frivolous.                                                                                                                            |
| PRECEDENTIAL VALUE    | published                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| PARTIES               | Adrian Damico Moon v. Caroline Van Zile                                                                                                                                                                                         |

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- motions to dismiss
- injunctions
- constitutional law

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- constitutional law
- federal courts

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint was frivolous and subject to dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).
2. Whether plaintiff was entitled to proceed in forma pauperis.

## HOLDINGS

1. A complaint lacking an arguable basis in law or fact, including one postulating wholly fanciful events and circumstances, is frivolous and must be dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i). The court held that plaintiff's complaint met that standard.
2. The court granted plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis.

## KEY QUOTATIONS

*“Complaints, as here, lacking “an arguable basis either in law or in fact,” Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989), and “postulating events and circumstances of a wholly fanciful kind,” Crisafi v. Holland, 655 F.2d 1305, 1307-08 (D.C. Cir. 1981), are frivolous actions subject to dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).” (2)*

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged that the defendant and others conspired to chill his constitutional rights after another case was dismissed. He also alleged that proceedings in federal court in Massachusetts and in an unidentified California court improperly denied him an opportunity to participate as a party or nonparty, causing fear, irreparable harm, and claimed damages of \$7 billion. The complaint sought an anti-stalking temporary restraining order and relied on numerous federal and District of Columbia statutes.

## PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Moon filed a complaint alleging that Van Zile and others conspired to interfere with his constitutional rights and seeking an anti-stalking temporary restraining order. The court granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis, concluded that the complaint lacked an arguable basis in law or fact and alleged wholly fanciful events, and ordered dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

## DISPOSITION

dismissed

## CASES CITED

- Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989)
- Crisafi v. Holland, 655 F.2d 1305, 1307-08 (D.C. Cir. 1981)
- Moon v. Satan, No. 25-cv-03988-TSC (D.D.C. Jan. 9, 2026)
- L.A. Alliance et al. v. County and City of Los Angeles et al., No. 2:20-cv-02291

## OPINION

Moon v. Van Zile

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ADRIAN DAMICO MOON, )

) Plaintiff, ) ) v. ) Civil Action No. 26-00891 (UNA) ) )

CAROLINE VAN ZILE, )

) Defendant. )

# MEMORANDUM OPINION

Plaintiff, appearing pro se, has filed a complaint and an application to proceed in forma pauperis (IFP). For the following reasons, the Court grants the IFP application and dismisses the complaint. Plaintiff or “daredeemer” has filed a document captioned “Petition for Anti-Stalking Temporary Restraining Order (T.R.O.) Against Underling of Satan’s Government Caroline Van Zile Pursuant to Federal [R]ule Civil Procedure 65(b)(1)-(4); D.C. Code Sections 22-3131 – 22- 3135; 18 U.S.C. 2261; 241; 242; 1113; 1201(A); 2381 Et. Seq.” 1 ECF No. 1. A subcaption states “Covid-19: Host, Hoax, or Holy Spirit.” Id. Suffice it to say, the complaint is rife with bizarre claims. Plaintiff alleges that “[o]n or about January 9, 2026, Respondents, Defendants, and Appellees, with vicious, evil, heinous, Hamas Domestic Terrorism criminally conspired then Dismissed” another case in this Court “to chill ‘daredeemer’ from exercising his constitutional rights while in his protected class.” Compl. ¶ 1 (citing Moon v. Satan, No. 25-cv-03988-TSC (D.D.C. Jan. 9, 2026)). Plaintiff makes similar allegations of motive with regard to (1) a case in 1 Presumably Van Zile is being sued in her capacity as Solicitor General of the District of Columbia. the U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts where on February 2, 2026, “daredeemer” was denied “his constitutional right to become a party and/or a non-party to da action,” which “caused ‘daredeemer’ to fear for his safety and cause irreparable harm and actual damages of \$7,000,000,000.00,” id. ¶ 2, and (2) a case in an unidentified court presumably in California where on “February 16, 17, 2026, “daredeemer” was denied the chance “to participate as a party and/or non-party” there. Id. ¶ 3 (citing 2:20-cv-02291, L.A. Alliance et. al. v. County and City of Los Angeles et al.). Complaints, as here, lacking “an arguable basis either in law or in fact,” Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989), and “postulating events and circumstances of a wholly fanciful kind,” Crisafi v. Holland, 655 F.2d 1305, 1307-08 (D.C. Cir. 1981), are frivolous actions subject to dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i). Therefore, this case will be dismissed by separate order. \_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_

RUDOLPH CONTRERAS

Date: April 30, 2026 United States District Judge 2