

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Moon v. Murphy

Moon · No. Civil Action No. 1:26-cv-00557 (UNA) · Decided May 8, 2026

SUMMARY

The U.S. 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 finds the allegations of an expansive criminal conspiracy and related misconduct irrational, wholly incredible, 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-00557 (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	Initial screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i), including dismissal of frivolous complaints and complaints lacking an arguable basis in law or fact.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	published district court memorandum opinion

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- pleadings
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint should be dismissed on initial review as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).
2. Whether the complaint's allegations were so irrational, fanciful, unsubstantial, and abusive of the judicial process that the court lacked subject matter jurisdiction to entertain them.

HOLDINGS

1. A complaint must be dismissed as frivolous when its allegations lack an arguable basis in law or fact and rise to the level of the irrational, wholly incredible, or wholly fanciful. Plaintiff's complaint met that standard and was properly dismissed.
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; the complaint at issue fell within that category.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"A complaint that lacks "an arguable basis either in law or in fact" is frivolous" (Memorandum Opinion)

"The instant Complaint falls into both categories; accordingly, the court cannot exercise subject matter jurisdiction over it." (Memorandum Opinion)

"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,"" (Memorandum Opinion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff sued a local California judge and alleged that she, other judges, and others including "Satan" participated in a criminal conspiracy to ignore or deny his motions, rule against him, and impose a pre-filing injunction. He also alleged various other crimes and wrongdoing, including stalking, false arrest, domestic terrorism, and destruction. The complaint was described as rambling, largely incomprehensible, and consisting in substantial part of sweeping religious proclamations.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a pro se complaint and an application for leave 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 action on initial review.

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. Murphy

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ADRIAN DAMICO MOON,)

) Plaintiff,)) v.) Civil Action No. 1:26-cv-00557 (UNA))

MARY ANN MURPHY,)

) 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, a local California judge, alleging that she, and many others, including several other judges and "Satan," have engaged in an "evil, vicious, heinous" criminal conspiracy to ignore or deny his motions, rule unfavorably, and enter a pre-filing injunction, and have also allegedly committed myriad other crimes and wrongdoing, including, but not limited to, stalking, false arrest, domestic terrorism, and destruction. 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