

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Adrian Damico Moon v. Michelle Williams Court

Moon v. Court · No. Civil Action No. 1:26-cv-00899 (UNA) · Decided May 8, 2026

SUMMARY

The U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia grants the plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis and dismisses his pro se complaint as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i). The court concludes that the allegations of a criminal conspiracy involving a federal judge and other purported wrongdoing are rambling, incomprehensible, irrational, and insufficient to support 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	May 8, 2026
DOCKET	Civil Action No. 1:26-cv-00899 (UNA)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	On initial review of a pro se complaint and an application to proceed in forma pauperis, the court granted the application and dismissed the complaint 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 may dismiss an in forma pauperis complaint that is frivolous or malicious. A complaint is frivolous when it lacks an arguable basis in law or fact or alleges irrational or wholly incredible facts.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published district court memorandum opinion; no separate precedential designation stated in the opinion text.
PARTIES	Adrian Damico Moon v. Michelle Williams Court

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- pleadings
- civil procedure
- civil rights

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the pro se complaint was frivolous or malicious and therefore subject to dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).
2. Whether allegations of an implausible conspiracy and other irrational or wholly incredible events could support a federal action.

HOLDINGS

1. A complaint must be dismissed on initial review when it lacks an arguable basis in law or fact or alleges irrational, wholly incredible, or fanciful events; Moon's complaint met those criteria and was frivolous and malicious.
2. Federal courts lack power to entertain claims that are so attenuated and unsubstantial as to be absolutely devoid of merit; the complaint therefore did not support the exercise of subject matter jurisdiction.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to ‘state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.’”

“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,””

“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.’”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Moon sued a federal judge, alleging that she and others participated in an evil and criminal conspiracy to dismiss his federal lawsuits and prevent him from intervening in other cases. He also alleged domestic terrorism and other nefarious conduct, while the complaint otherwise consisted largely of sweeping religious proclamations.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a pro se complaint against a federal judge alleging an implausible criminal conspiracy and other wrongdoing. The district court granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis and dismissed the action on initial review as frivolous and malicious.

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. Newbury, 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. Court

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ADRIAN DAMICO MOON,)

) Plaintiff,)) v.) Civil Action No. 1:26-cv-00899 (UNA))

MICHELLE WILLIAMS COURT,)

) 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, a federal judge, alleging that she and others have engaged in an "evil, vicious, heinous" criminal conspiracy to dismiss his federal lawsuits and prevent him from intervening in other cases, and that they have also allegedly committed myriad other crimes, including, but not limited to, "domestic terrorism," and other nefarious wrongdoing that has caused 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 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