

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
INDIANA, INDIANAPOLIS DIVISION

Hunter Alexander v. John Does, I.R.S., U.S. Postal

Alexander · No. 1:26-cv-00525-JPH-MJD · Decided April 1, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana grants Hunter Alexander leave to proceed in forma pauperis subject to an initial partial filing fee of \$18.32. The court dismisses the complaint with prejudice as frivolous and for failure to state a claim, denies the motion for recruited counsel, and warns that the dismissal may count as a strike under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). The court also warns Alexander that continued frivolous filings may result in filing restrictions or monetary sanctions.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana, Indianapolis Division
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana
DECIDED	April 1, 2026
DOCKET	1:26-cv-00525-JPH-MJD
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court screened a pro se prisoner's complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, ruled on his motion to proceed in forma pauperis and motion for recruited counsel, and dismissed the complaint with prejudice.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b), the court must dismiss any portion of a prisoner's complaint that is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim, or seeks monetary relief from an immune defendant. The failure-to-state-a-claim inquiry applies the Rule 12(b)(6) standard, including whether the complaint states a plausible claim for relief.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; nonprecedential
PARTIES	Hunter Alexander v. John Does, I.R.S., U.S. Postal

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- motions to dismiss
- pleadings
- section 1983
- sanctions

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure prisoner civil rights in forma pauperis proceedings tax-related claims
court sanctions and filing restrictions

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint should be dismissed as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A because it rested in part on an allegation of a nonexistent currency denomination.
2. Whether the allegations concerning difficulty filing tax records and maintaining business records stated a claim against the IRS or Postal Service where the complaint did not allege their personal involvement in the asserted deprivation.
3. Whether dismissal should be with prejudice without leave to amend.
4. Whether Alexander was entitled to recruited counsel in light of the wholly meritless claims.
5. Whether the court should warn Alexander that the dismissal may constitute a strike under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) and that continued frivolous filings could result in filing restrictions or monetary sanctions.

HOLDINGS

1. The allegation that a new currency denomination described as "\$000.59³" had been introduced was factually frivolous because it was plainly baseless.
2. The allegations that incarceration impeded Alexander's ability to file tax records or maintain business records failed to state a claim against the IRS or Postal Service because the complaint did not allege that either defendant was involved in the alleged deprivation.
3. Dismissal with prejudice without an opportunity to amend or show cause was proper because there was no chance Alexander could amend the complaint to state a viable claim based on the allegations presented.
4. The motion for recruited counsel was denied because the case was wholly meritless and it was not in the interest of justice to recruit counsel.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face." (Section II.A)

"lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact." (Section II.C)

"clearly baseless, fanciful, fantastic, delusional, irrational, or wholly incredible." (Section II.C)

"based on an indisputably meritless legal theory." (Section II.C)

"request" counsel." (Section III)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Alexander alleged that the United States Postal Service introduced a new currency denomination described as "\$000.59³," which he characterized as an invalid "tenth" denomination. He claimed that this alleged currency issue caused tax-related problems and that his incarceration caused him to lose business documents, impairing his ability to address tax matters and maintain records. He sought damages from the IRS, the Postal Service, and John Doe defendants.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Alexander filed a complaint alleging that the Postal Service introduced an invalid currency denomination and that his incarceration impaired his ability to address tax matters and maintain business records. The court granted in forma pauperis status subject to an initial partial filing fee, denied recruited counsel, screened the complaint, and dismissed it with prejudice as frivolous and for failure to state a claim. The court also warned that the dismissal may count as a strike under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) and that continued frivolous filings could result in filing restrictions or monetary sanctions.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Alexander v. Does, Car Makers, No. 1:26-cv-00528-JMS-KMB (S.D. Ind. Mar. 18, 2026)
- Alexander v. Does (old electrical in HUMS, septic in dirt, water lines in dirt), No. 1:26-cv-00521-TWP-MG (S.D. Ind. Mar. 18, 2026)
- Alexander v. John Does (Microwave, Stove, Prop[a]ne, LLC), No. 1:26-cv-523-MPB-MG (S.D. Ind. Mar. 18, 2026)
- Alexander v. John Does, Trash Companies, EPA, No. 1:26-cv-00526-JRS-KMB (S.D. Ind. Mar. 18, 2026)
- Alexander v. John Doe, Gas Stations, No. 1:26-cv-00531-SEB-TAB (S.D. Ind. Mar. 19, 2026)
- Whitaker v. Dempsey, 83 F.4th 1059, 1061 (7th Cir. 2023)
- Schillinger v. Kiley, 954 F.3d 990, 993 (7th Cir. 2020)
- Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)
- Cesal v. Moats, 851 F.3d 714, 720 (7th Cir. 2017)
- Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989)
- Felton v. City of Chicago, 827 F.3d 632, 635 (7th Cir. 2016)
- Colbert v. City of Chicago, 851 F.3d 649, 657 (7th Cir. 2017)
- Luevano v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., 722 F.3d 1014, 1022 (7th Cir. 2013)
- Egwuenu v. Charles Schwab & Co., 834 F. App'x 245 (7th Cir. Jan. 21, 2021) (unpublished)
- Walker v. Price, 900 F.3d 933, 938 (7th Cir. 2018)
- Mallard v. United States District Court, 490 U.S. 296, 300 (1989)
- Watts v. Kidman, 42 F.4th 755, 764, 766 (7th Cir. 2022)

- Hill v. Madison Cty., Ill., 983 F.3d 904, 906 (7th Cir. 2020)
- Montgomery v. Davis, 362 F.3d 956, 957 (7th Cir. 2004)
- In re McDonald, 489 U.S. 180, 184 (1989)
- Support Sys. Int'l v. Mack, 45 F.3d 185, 186 (7th Cir. 1995)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-southern-district-of-in/2026/hunter-alexander-v-john-does-i-r-s-u-s-postal-nzwo5fa0>