

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Moon v. Henderson

Moon · No. Civil Action No. 26-00892 (UNA) · Decided April 30, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Columbia grants the pro se 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 allegations lack an arguable basis in law or fact and involve fanciful events and circumstances.

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 30, 2026
DOCKET	Civil Action No. 26-00892 (UNA)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	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 under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court screened the complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) and determined whether it was frivolous.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published district court memorandum opinion

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- pleadings
- injunctions
- civil rights

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the plaintiff's complaint was frivolous and therefore subject to dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

2. Whether the plaintiff should be granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis.

HOLDINGS

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

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)." (2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged that Judge Karen L. Henderson and unidentified individuals had criminally conspired in connection with the dismissal or handling of several cases, causing plaintiff to fear for his safety and suffer alleged constitutional violations and damages. The complaint invoked numerous federal statutes, D.C. Code provisions, and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65, and sought an anti-stalking temporary restraining order. The court characterized the allegations as lacking an arguable basis in law or fact and as postulating wholly fanciful events.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff initiated this action by filing a complaint seeking an anti-stalking temporary restraining order and an application to proceed in forma pauperis. The court granted the IFP application but dismissed the complaint, concluding that it lacked an arguable basis in law or fact and alleged wholly fanciful events.

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)
- Moon v. Satan, No. 25-cv-03988-TSC (D.D.C. Jan. 9, 2026)
- L.A. Alliance et al. v. County and City of Los Angeles et al., No. 2:20-cv-02291

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ADRIAN DAMICO MOON,)) Plaintiff,)) v.) Civil Action No. 26-00892 (UNA))) KAREN L. HENDERSON,)) Defendant.) MEMORANDUM OPINION Plaintiff, appearing pro se, has filed a complaint and an application to proceed in forma pauperis (IFP).

For the following reasons, the Court grants the IFP application and dismisses the complaint. Plaintiff or “daredeemer” has filed a document captioned “Petition for Anti-Stalking Temporary Restr[ai]ning Order (T.R.O.) Against Underlings of Satan’s Government Karen L. Henderson Pursuant to Federal Rules 65(b)(1-4); D.C. Code sections 541; 22-3131 – 22-3135; 18 U.S.C. 2261; 241; 242; 113; 1201(a); 2381 Et.

Seq.” 1 ECF No. 1. Plaintiff alleges that on March 5, 2026, “Respondents, Defendants, and Appellees, with evil, vicious, heinous, Hamas Domestic Terrorism criminally conspired then dismissed case entitled Moon vs Satan et. al. case no. 25-5702 without adjudicating any of da pending motions causing daredeemer to fear for his safety.” Compl. ¶ 1, ECF No. 1. “On or about March 1, 2026” those same unidentified individuals with the same “evil” motives “failed to turn themselves over into da custody of da Metropolitan District of Columbia Police Department to await arraignment and Bond hearings for their crimes[.]” Id. ¶ 2.

1 The named defendant is presumed to be Judge Karen L. Henderson of the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals. Also on January 9, 2026, those “Respondents, Defendants, and Appellees... criminally conspired then Dismissed [Plaintiff’s] case... to chill ‘daredeemer’ from exercising his constitutional rights while in his protected class.” Compl. ¶ 3 (citing Moon v. Satan, No. 25-cv-03988-TSC (D.D.C.

Jan. 9, 2026)). Plaintiff makes similar allegations of motive with regard to (1) a case in the U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts where on February 2, 2026, “daredeemer” was denied “his constitutional right to become a party and/or a non-party to da action,” which “caused ‘daredeemer’ to fear for his safety and cause irreparable harm and actual damages of \$7,000,000,000.00,” id. ¶ 4, and (2) a case in an unidentified court presumably in California where on “February 16, 17, 2026, “daredeemer” was denied the chance “to participate as a party and/or non-party” there and thus suffered the same harm.

Id. ¶ 5 (citing 2:20-cv-02291, L.A. Alliance et. al. v. County and City of Los Angeles et al.). 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).

Therefore, this case will be dismissed by separate order. _____/s/_____ RUDOLPH CONTRERAS Date: April 30, 2026 United States District Judge 2

