

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Moon v. Barger-Leibrich

Moon · No. 1:26-cv-00777 (UNA) · Decided May 8, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States 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 concludes that the rambling allegations of an expansive criminal conspiracy are irrational, wholly incredible, and insufficient to support 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	1:26-cv-00777 (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	On initial review under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i), the court evaluates whether the complaint is frivolous. A complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to state a claim that is plausible on its face; a complaint is frivolous when it lacks an arguable basis in law or fact or alleges irrational, wholly incredible, or wholly fanciful events.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published district court memorandum opinion; persuasive authority within the jurisdiction, subject to applicable local rules.

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- pleadings
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the pro se complaint was frivolous and subject to dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).
2. Whether the complaint's irrational, wholly incredible, and legally or factually insubstantial allegations deprived the court of subject matter jurisdiction.

HOLDINGS

1. A complaint must be dismissed as frivolous when it lacks an arguable basis in law or fact or alleges irrational, wholly incredible, or wholly fanciful events. Plaintiff's complaint fell within those categories and was dismissed.
2. Federal courts lack power to entertain claims that are otherwise within their jurisdiction when the claims are so attenuated and unsubstantial as to be absolutely devoid of merit; the complaint therefore could not support the exercise of subject matter jurisdiction.
3. A complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face; this complaint did not satisfy that standard.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"A complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to 'state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.'"

"A complaint that lacks 'an arguable basis either in law or in fact' is frivolous"

"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 Adrian Damico Moon sued Katheryn Ann Barger-Leibrich, alleging that she and numerous others, including judges and a spiritual being, engaged in an evil criminal conspiracy to dismiss his federal lawsuits and deny him opportunities to intervene in other federal cases. The complaint also alleged domestic terrorism, other crimes, and conduct causing plaintiff to fear for his safety. The pleading was described as rambling, largely incomprehensible, and consisting in substantial part of sweeping religious proclamations.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a pro se complaint alleging that the defendant and numerous other persons and entities, including judges and a spiritual being, participated in criminal conspiracies and other wrongdoing against him. The district court conducted its initial review, granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis, and dismissed the action as frivolous without further proceedings.

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)