

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Moon v. Davenport

Moon · No. Civil Action No. 1:26-cv-00889 (UNA) · Decided May 8, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Columbia grants Plaintiff Adrian Damico Moon’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 complaint’s allegations of an extensive 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-00889 (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 screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i), accepting well-pleaded factual allegations as true for purposes of determining whether the complaint states a plausible claim and whether it is frivolous.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published district court memorandum opinion

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- federal courts
- in forma pauperis litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint was sufficiently plausible and legally or factually supported to proceed.
2. Whether the complaint was frivolous and malicious under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i), requiring dismissal.

HOLDINGS

1. A court must dismiss an in forma pauperis complaint as frivolous when it lacks an arguable basis in law or fact or alleges facts rising to the level of the irrational or wholly incredible.
2. A complaint that is plainly abusive of the judicial process is malicious and subject to dismissal under the in forma pauperis screening statute.
3. Federal courts lack power to entertain claims that are so attenuated and unsubstantial as to be absolutely devoid of merit.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“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.’”

“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 alleging that Defendant, judges, other individuals, and Satan had participated in a criminal conspiracy to dismiss his federal lawsuits and deny him the opportunity to intervene in other federal cases. The complaint also alleged domestic terrorism and other wrongdoing, followed by sweeping religious proclamations. The court found the allegations irrational, wholly incredible, and lacking an arguable basis in law or fact.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a pro se complaint against Defendant and applied to proceed in forma pauperis. The court granted the application, reviewed the complaint sua sponte, determined that it was frivolous and malicious because it lacked an arguable basis in law or fact and was plainly abusive of the judicial process, and dismissed the case.

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. Davenport

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ADRIAN DAMICO MOON,)

) Plaintiff,)) v.) Civil Action No. 1:26-cv-00889 (UNA))

FESIA DAVENPORT,)

) 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 she, and many others—including judges and "Satan, a spiritual being, a.k.a 'Lucifer da fallen loser'"—have engaged in an "evil, vicious, heinous" criminal conspiracy against him to dismiss his federal lawsuits and to deny him the opportunity to intervene in other federal cases, and have also allegedly committed myriad other crimes and wrongdoing, including, but not limited to, "domestic terrorism," and other nefarious actions that cause 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 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