

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

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

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-columbia-united-states-district-court-for-the-distr/2026/moon-v-van-zile-3hzqox9c>