

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Moon v. Henderson

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

OPINION

Moon v. Henderson

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