

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Moon v. Boddie

Civil Action No. 1:26-cv-00898 (UNA) (D.D.C. May 8, 2026) · No. Civil Action No. 1:26-cv-00898 (UNA) ·
Decided May 8, 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 of conspiracy, criminal wrongdoing, and related religious proclamations are irrational, incomprehensible, and insufficient to establish 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-00898 (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 of an in forma pauperis complaint, the court may dismiss a case if the action is frivolous or malicious under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published memorandum opinion; no separate precedential designation appears in the document text.

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- pleadings
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- Civil procedure
- Federal jurisdiction
- Civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the 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 alleged claims were so unsubstantial and attenuated that the court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over them.

HOLDINGS

1. A complaint may be dismissed as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) when its factual allegations are irrational, wholly incredible, or fanciful, and a complaint that is plainly abusive of the judicial process may be dismissed as malicious. The court held that this complaint fell into both categories.
2. The complaint failed to state a plausible claim for relief because it did not contain sufficient factual matter to support a claim that was plausible on its face.
3. Federal courts lack power to entertain claims that are so attenuated and unsubstantial as to be absolutely devoid of merit; the court therefore could not exercise subject matter jurisdiction over the complaint.

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”

“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.’”

“a court shall dismiss a complaint as frivolous “when the facts alleged rise to the level of the irrational or the wholly incredible,””

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff filed a rambling and largely incomprehensible pro se complaint against a single defendant. He alleged that the defendant and others participated in an evil and criminal conspiracy to dismiss his federal lawsuits and prevent him from intervening in other cases, along with allegations of domestic terrorism and other wrongdoing. The complaint also contained sweeping religious proclamations and allegations that caused plaintiff to fear for his safety.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a pro se complaint against John Boddie and an application for leave to proceed in forma pauperis. The district court granted the in forma pauperis application, conducted its initial review, determined that the complaint was frivolous and maliciously abusive of the judicial process, and dismissed the case without further proceedings.

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. 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)

OPINION

Moon v. Boddie

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ADRIAN DAMICO MOON,)

) Plaintiff,)) v.) Civil Action No. 1:26-cv-00898 (UNA))

JOHN BODDIE,)

) 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 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