

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