

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Moon v. Trump

Moon · No. Civil Action No. 1:26-cv-00905 (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 allegations of conspiracy, stalking, attempted murder, theft, and related misconduct are irrational, wholly incredible, and insufficient to establish a plausible claim or invoke 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-00905 (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 sua sponte 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 assessed whether the complaint stated a plausible claim and whether it was frivolous or malicious. 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

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- pleadings
- motions to dismiss
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint was frivolous or maliciously abusive of the judicial process under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).
2. Whether the district court could exercise subject matter jurisdiction over claims that were so attenuated and unsubstantial as to be absolutely devoid of merit.

HOLDINGS

1. A complaint must be dismissed on initial review under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) 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 because its allegations were rambling, incomprehensible, irrational, and fanciful.
2. Federal courts lack power to entertain claims otherwise within their jurisdiction when the claims are so attenuated and unsubstantial as to be absolutely devoid of merit. Because the complaint fell into that category, the court could not exercise subject matter jurisdiction over it.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to ‘state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.’” (556 U.S. at 678)

“A complaint that lacks ‘an arguable basis either in law or in fact’ is frivolous” (490 U.S. at 325)

“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.’” (415 U.S. at 536-37)

“when the facts alleged rise to the level of the irrational or the wholly incredible” (504 U.S. at 33)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged that the President and others, including judges, conspired with Satan and Lucifer to interfere with his litigation, dismiss his federal lawsuits, and designate him a vexatious litigant. He also alleged that the President and others stalked him and engaged in attempted murder, theft, mayhem, and destruction. The court found the allegations rambling, largely incomprehensible, irrational, and wholly incredible.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a pro se complaint against Donald J. Trump and an application to proceed in forma pauperis. The court granted in forma pauperis status, determined that the complaint was both 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. Trump

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ADRIAN DAMICO MOON,)

) Plaintiff,)) v.) Civil Action No. 1:26-cv-00905 (UNA))

DONALD JOHN TRUMP,)

) 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, the President of the United States, alleging that he and others, including judges, have "conspired at da behest of Satan, Lucifer da fallen Loser to actively participate[], aid, and abet da to Kill, Steal, and Destroy," to interfere with "Puffy in da trial court and the appellate court as well," to dismiss his federal lawsuits, and to deem Plaintiff a vexatious litigant. He contends that this criminal conspiracy is "evil, vicious, [and] heinous," and that the President and others have stalked him and engaged in attempted murder, theft, mayhem, and destruction. "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 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