

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)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-columbia-united-states-district-court-for-the-distr/2026/moon-v-davenport-iatb31a5>