

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

OMAR MEDINA ALEJANDRO,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 22-623 (UNA)
)	
RANDOLPH D. MOSS,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Plaintiff, appearing *pro se*, has filed a form Complaint for a Civil Case, ECF No. 1, and an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, ECF No. 2. The Court will grant the application and dismiss the case.

Plaintiff is a resident of San Pedro, California, who has sued U.S. District Judge Randolph D. Moss, a judge of this Court. Plaintiff wants, among other relief, “41 Million dollars for my previous complaint on Rob Bonta” and for Judge Moss to “resig[n] his post as judge,” apparently because Judge Moss dismissed Plaintiff’s “case with the court, 22-0263 (UNA)[.]” Compl. at 4; *see Medina v. Bonta*, No. 22-cv-263 (D.D.C. Feb. 23, 2022) (dismissing complaint without prejudice for insufficient pleading).¹ Under Statement of Claim, Plaintiff asserts puzzling theories about wearing “Halloween face masks.” Compl. at 4.

“[F]ederal courts are without power to entertain claims otherwise within their jurisdiction if,” as here, “they are so attenuated and unsubstantial as to be absolutely devoid of merit, wholly insubstantial, [or] obviously frivolous[.]” *Hagans v. Lavine*, 415 U.S. 528, 536–37 (1974). The

¹ Plaintiff has filed numerous complaints in this court in the name of “Omar Medina Alejandro” or “Omar Alejandro Medina.”

instant complaint against a judge who has “done nothing more than [his] duty” is “a meritless action.” *Fleming v. United States*, 847 F. Supp. 170, 172 (D.D.C. 1994), *cert. denied* 513 U.S. 1150 (1995); *accord Caldwell v. Kagan*, 777 F. Supp. 2d 177, 179 (D.D.C. 2011) (finding “claims against the district and court of appeals judges . . . patently frivolous because federal judges are absolutely immune from lawsuits predicated, as here, for their official acts”). Consequently, this case will be dismissed with prejudice. *See Firestone v. Firestone*, 76 F.3d 1205, 1209 (D.C. Cir. 1996) (per curiam) (“A dismissal with prejudice is warranted . . . when a trial court ‘determines that the allegation of other facts consistent with the challenged pleading could not possibly cure the deficiency.’”) (quoting *Jarrell v. United States Postal Serv.*, 753 F.2d 1088, 1091 (D.C. Cir. 1985) (emphasis omitted)). A separate order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

_____/s/_____
AMIT P. MEHTA
United States District Judge

Date: March 30, 2022