

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Moon v. Bass

Moon v. Bass · No. Civil Action No. 1:26-cv-00888 (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 and 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 other wrongdoing are irrational, wholly incredible, and insufficient to invoke federal 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-00888 (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 the application and dismissed the complaint as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Initial review of a complaint filed by a plaintiff proceeding in forma pauperis under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i); allegations are accepted as true for purposes of determining whether the complaint states a plausible claim, but claims lacking an arguable basis in law or fact may be dismissed as frivolous.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published memorandum opinion with no reporter citation identified in the source
PARTIES	Adrian Damico Moon v. Karen Ruth Bass

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- pleadings
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the pro se complaint stated a plausible claim for relief.
2. Whether the complaint was frivolous or maliciously abusive of the judicial process and therefore subject to dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).
3. Whether the attenuated and insubstantial nature of the allegations deprived the court of subject matter jurisdiction.

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint failed to state a plausible claim because it was rambling, largely incomprehensible, and consisted of sweeping, unsupported allegations of an expansive criminal conspiracy and other wrongdoing.
2. The complaint was frivolous and maliciously abusive of the judicial process, and dismissal was required under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).
3. The court could not exercise subject matter jurisdiction over claims that were so attenuated and insubstantial 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.’” (678)

“A complaint that lacks “an arguable basis either in law or in fact” is frivolous” (325)

“when the facts alleged rise to the level of the irrational or the wholly incredible” (33)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff sued Karen Ruth Bass, identified in the complaint as the Mayor of Los Angeles, alleging that she and numerous others, including judges and supernatural figures, participated in an expansive criminal conspiracy to rule against him, issue injunctions, and designate him a vexatious litigant. The complaint also alleged numerous other crimes and forms of wrongdoing, including stalking, murder, theft, false arrest, kidnapping, and terrorism. The court found the pleading rambling, largely incomprehensible, and based on irrational, wholly incredible, and fanciful allegations.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a pro se complaint against the Mayor of Los Angeles and an application to proceed in forma pauperis. The court granted the in forma pauperis application, determined that the complaint was both frivolous and maliciously abusive of the judicial process, and dismissed the action on initial review.

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, 1309 (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)