

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Jones v. Dover Downs

Jones v. Dover Downs · No. 25-04450 (UNA) · Decided April 14, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Columbia grants the pro se plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis and dismisses the complaint. The court concludes that the allegations lack an arguable basis in law or fact and are frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Columbia
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Rudolph Contreras
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Columbia
DECIDED	April 14, 2026
DOCKET	25-04450 (UNA)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Pro se plaintiff filed a complaint and an application to proceed in forma pauperis. The district court granted the IFP application and dismissed the complaint as frivolous.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The complaint was screened under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) for frivolousness.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	published

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- pleadings

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- federal courts

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the complaint was frivolous and subject to dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).
- Whether the plaintiff should be granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis.

HOLDINGS

1. The court granted plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis.
2. A complaint lacking an arguable basis in law or fact and postulating wholly fanciful events is frivolous and subject to dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i). The plaintiff's complaint was dismissed as frivolous.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Complaints, as here, lacking “an arguable basis either in law or in fact,” Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989), and “postulating events and circumstances of a wholly fanciful kind,” Crisafi v. Holland, 655 F.2d 1305, 1307-08 (D.C. Cir. 1981), are frivolous actions subject to dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff, a resident of Greenwood, Delaware, sued Dover Downs, a business located in Dover, Delaware. He alleged that Dover Downs created or planned to create him in extremely unhealthy circumstances involving numerous alleged harms and sought damages exceeding \$999 trillion.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Matthew Jones filed suit against Dover Downs in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and sought to proceed in forma pauperis. The court granted the application and dismissed the complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i), indicating that dismissal would be entered by separate order.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989)
- Crisafi v. Holland, 655 F.2d 1305, 1307-08 (D.C. Cir. 1981)