

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Moon v. Carter

Moon v. Carter · No. Civil Action No. 1:26-cv-00669 (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 but dismisses the complaint as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i). The court concludes that the allegations against a federal district judge are irrational, insubstantial, 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-00669 (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. A complaint is frivolous when it lacks an arguable basis in law or fact or alleges irrational, wholly incredible, or fanciful events.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published memorandum opinion; no reporter citation appears in the source.

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights

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 that were irrational, wholly incredible, and devoid of legal or factual merit deprived the court of subject matter jurisdiction.

HOLDINGS

1. A complaint may be dismissed on initial review as frivolous when it lacks an arguable basis in law or fact, alleges irrational or wholly incredible events, or is plainly abusive of the judicial process; Plaintiff's complaint met those criteria.
2. Federal courts lack power to entertain claims that are otherwise within their jurisdiction when the claims are so attenuated and unsubstantial as to be absolutely devoid of merit; Plaintiff's complaint fell within that category.

KEY QUOTATIONS

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

“The instant complaint falls into both categories; accordingly, the court cannot exercise subject matter jurisdiction over it.”

“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,””

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff sued a federal district judge, alleging that the judge participated in a criminal conspiracy involving domestic terrorism to kill, intimidate, harass, and stalk him. The complaint also contained sweeping religious proclamations and allegations that the court found irrational, wholly incredible, and abusive of the judicial process.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a pro se complaint against a federal district judge and applied to proceed in forma pauperis. The district court granted in forma pauperis status and, on initial review, dismissed the action as frivolous and lacking a basis for subject matter jurisdiction.

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)