

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Moon v. Bang

Moon v. Bang · No. Civil Action No. 1:26-cv-00771 (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 a broad conspiracy and other wrongdoing are irrational, incomprehensible, and insufficient to invoke 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	Civil Action No. 1:26-cv-00771 (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 in forma pauperis application and sua sponte dismissed the action as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Initial screening of an in forma pauperis complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i); the court also applied the plausibility standard under Ashcroft v. Iqbal and Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published district court memorandum opinion; persuasive authority within the District of Columbia and nonbinding authority elsewhere.
PARTIES	Adrian Damico Moon v. Diane Bang

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- pleadings
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- federal courts
- civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint stated a plausible claim for relief.
2. Whether the complaint was frivolous or malicious because it lacked an arguable basis in law or fact and alleged irrational or wholly incredible events.
3. Whether the court was required to dismiss the complaint during in forma pauperis screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint failed to state a plausible claim because its allegations were rambling, largely incomprehensible, and did not contain sufficient factual matter supporting relief.
2. A complaint is frivolous when it lacks an arguable basis in law or fact or alleges irrational or wholly incredible events, and a complaint that is plainly abusive of the judicial process may be treated as malicious. Plaintiff's complaint was both frivolous and malicious.
3. The court could not exercise subject matter jurisdiction over the complaint because the claims were so attenuated and unsubstantial as to be absolutely devoid of merit, and the complaint was required to be dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A complaint that lacks “an arguable basis either in law or in fact” is frivolous”

“The instant Complaint falls into both categories; accordingly, the court cannot exercise subject matter jurisdiction over it.”

“For all of the foregoing reasons, the Complaint, ECF No. 1, and this case, are dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff sued Diane Bang and alleged that she and numerous others, including judges and a spiritual being, participated in a criminal conspiracy to dismiss his federal lawsuits and deny him opportunities to intervene in other federal cases. The complaint also alleged various crimes and wrongdoing, including domestic terrorism, and consisted largely of sweeping religious proclamations. The court found the allegations rambling, largely incomprehensible, irrational, and wholly incredible.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a pro se complaint and an application for leave to proceed in forma pauperis. The district court granted the application, reviewed the complaint at the initial screening stage, and dismissed the case as 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)
- 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)

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ADRIAN DAMICO MOON,)) Plaintiff,)) v.) Civil Action No. 1:26-cv-00771 (UNA)) DIANE BANG,)) Defendant.) MEMORANDUM OPINION This matter is before the court on its initial review of Plaintiff's pro se Complaint, ECF No. 1, and Application for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis, ECF No. 2.

The court grants the in forma pauperis Application, and for the reasons discussed below, dismisses this matter as frivolous. Plaintiff's Complaint is rambling and largely incomprehensible. He sues a single Defendant, alleging that she, and many others—including several judges and “Satan, a spiritual being, a.k.a ‘Lucifer da fallen loser’”—have engaged in an “evil, vicious, heinous” criminal conspiracy against him to dismiss his federal lawsuits and to deny him the opportunity to intervene in other federal cases, and have also allegedly committed myriad other crimes and assorted wrongdoing, including, but not limited to, “domestic terrorism,” and other nefarious actions that cause him to fear for his safety.

The remainder of the pleading consists of sweeping religious proclamations. “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 a “complaint plainly abusive of the judicial process is properly typed malicious,” Crisafi v. Holland, 655 F.2d 1305, 1309 (D.C.

Cir. 1981). The instant Complaint falls into both categories; accordingly, the court cannot exercise subject matter jurisdiction over it. See 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) (examining cases dismissed “for patent insubstantiality,” including where the plaintiff allegedly “was subjected to a campaign of surveillance and harassment.”). As here, a court shall dismiss a complaint as frivolous “when the facts alleged rise to the level of the irrational or the wholly incredible,” *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 33 (1992), or “postulat[e] events and circumstances of a wholly fanciful kind,” *Crisafi*, 655 F.2d at 1307–08 (D.C.

Cir. 1981); see also *Ibrahim v. Dist. of Columbia*, Nos. 93–0002, Civ. A. 93–0060, 1993 WL 30814, at *1 (D.D.C. Jan. 29, 1993) (finding the plaintiff’s “assertion that... matters were decided against him because the Courts conspired” against him was frivolous where the “facts only support the notion that the Judges in... those cases diligently worked on his complaints [but] decided them against him”), appeal dismissed sub nom.

Ibrahim v. D.C. Dep’t of Corrections, No. 93-7029, 1993 WL 328110 (D.C. Cir. July 7, 1993) (per curiam) (finding no basis for appeal). For all of the foregoing reasons, the Complaint, ECF No. 1, and this case, are dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i). A separate Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion. DATE: May 8, 2026 /s/ CHRISTOPHER R. COOPER
United States District Judge