

MAY 23 2025

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90080

ORDER

An individual has filed a Complaint against a United States district judge under the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980, 28 U.S.C. §§ 351–364, and the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States.

Background

The record establishes that Complainant and another individual filed a civil complaint against multiple defendants. The plaintiffs later moved to amend their complaint to add two judges as defendants. The Subject Judge issued an order dismissing the case for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction. Afterward, Complainant filed a document stating that he submitted a written request to the Subject Judge’s chambers seeking access to her oath of office and surety bond and that she engaged in misconduct by failing to respond.

Complaint

Complainant alleges the Subject Judge failed or refused to respond to his lawful request for a copy of her oath of office and surety bond, “violating standards of judicial transparency, constitutional rights, and public accountability.” He states that after he amended his complaint to allege claims against judges, the Subject Judge abruptly terminated his case on alleged “technical grounds,” despite clear evidence that his filings were timely and compliant. He states, “This suggests retaliation and bias against me for properly naming public officials as defendants, further undermining due process and judicial impartiality.” Finally, he alleges the Subject Judge’s actions violated his constitutional rights, potentially violated criminal statutes, and damaged public trust in the judicial system. He attached documents to his Complaint.

Discussion

Judicial-Conduct Rule 4(b)(1) provides in part that “[c]ognizable misconduct does not include an allegation that calls into question the correctness of a judge’s ruling, including a failure to recuse.” The Commentary on Rule 4 explains the rationale for this rule as follows:

Rule 4(b)(1) tracks the Act, 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii), in excluding from the definition of misconduct allegations “[d]irectly related to the merits of a decision or procedural ruling.” This exclusion preserves the independence of judges in the exercise of judicial authority by ensuring that the complaint procedure is not used to collaterally call into question the

substance of a judge's decision or procedural ruling. Any allegation that calls into question the correctness of an official decision or procedural ruling of a judge — without more — is merits-related.

The Complaint fails to present a basis for a finding of misconduct. To the extent Complainant's allegations concern the substance of the Subject Judge's official actions, findings, rulings, and orders in the above-described case, the allegations are directly related to the merits of the Subject Judge's decisions or procedural rulings. Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(B). Complainant's remaining claims are based on allegations lacking sufficient evidence to raise an inference that the Subject Judge acted with an illicit or improper motive, retaliated against him, was biased or otherwise not impartial, committed a crime, or otherwise engaged in misconduct. Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D). For these reasons, this Complaint is **DISMISSED**.

/s/ William H. Pryor Jr.
Chief Judge