

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Gueorgui Hristov Pantchev v. Molly C. Dwyer, et al.

Pantchev · No. 25-2786 (UNA) · Decided April 13, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Columbia grants Plaintiff Gueorgui Hristov Pantchev’s application to proceed in forma pauperis but dismisses the pro se complaint without prejudice. The court concludes that the complaint is frivolous because its allegations are conclusory, inflammatory, and unsupported by factual allegations sufficient to establish a plausible claim.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Columbia
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Amir H. Ali
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Columbia
DECIDED	April 13, 2026
DOCKET	25-2786 (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 leave to proceed in forma pauperis but dismissed the complaint without prejudice as frivolous.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	On initial review, the court accepted well-pleaded factual allegations as true and assessed whether the complaint stated a plausible claim. A complaint lacking an arguable basis in law or fact may be dismissed as frivolous, and a frivolous complaint is subject to dismissal for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published memorandum opinion; no reporter citation appears in the opinion text.
PARTIES	Gueorgui Hristov Pantchev v. Molly C. Dwyer, et al.

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- pleadings
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the pro se complaint stated a plausible claim for relief.
2. Whether the complaint was frivolous because it lacked an arguable basis in law or fact and therefore could not support federal subject matter jurisdiction.

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint failed to state a plausible claim because its allegations were conclusory and lacked sufficient factual matter.
2. The complaint was frivolous because it lacked an arguable basis in law or fact, and it therefore had to be dismissed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to ‘state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.’” (at 1)

“A complaint that lacks “an arguable basis either in law or in fact” is frivolous.” (at 1)

“Consequently, a court is obligated to dismiss a complaint as frivolous “when the facts alleged rise to the level of the irrational or the wholly incredible.”” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The pro se complaint consisted of scattered insults and inflammatory language. The court found that the allegations were conclusory and lacked any factual basis, rendering the complaint frivolous.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a pro se complaint and an application for leave to proceed in forma pauperis. The court granted the application and, on initial review, dismissed the complaint without prejudice because its allegations were conclusory, lacked a factual basis, and were frivolous.

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)
- 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)

OPINION

Pantchev

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

GUEORGUI HRISTOV PANTCHEV,)

) Plaintiff,)) v.) Civil Action No. 25-2786 (UNA)) MOLLY C. DWYER, et al.,)) Defendants.)

Memorandum Opinion This matter is before the court on initial review of Plaintiff’s application for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, ECF No. 2, and pro se complaint, ECF No. 1. The court will grant the application, and for the reasons discussed below, dismiss the complaint without prejudice. “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 the court cannot exercise subject matter jurisdiction over a frivolous complaint. *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) (explaining that courts may dismiss cases “for patent insubstantiality,” including where plaintiff allegedly “was subjected to a campaign of surveillance and harassment deriving from uncertain origins”). Consequently, a court is obligated to dismiss a complaint as frivolous “when 1 the facts alleged rise to the level of the irrational or the wholly incredible.” *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 33 (1992). The complaint consists of scattered insults and inflammatory language. Its allegations are conclusory and lack any factual basis. The complaint is frivolous, and therefore must be dismissed. A separate order accompanies this memorandum opinion. DATE: April 13, 2026 AMIR H. ALI United States District Judge 2