

AUG. 25 2025

CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Judicial Council of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90086

ORDER

Before: ROSENBAUM, NEWSOM, and BRANCH, Circuit Judges; BEAVERSTOCK and WINSOR, Chief District Judges.

Pursuant to 11th Cir. JCDR 18.3, this Judicial Council Review Panel has considered the materials described in JCDR 18(c)(2), including petitioner's complaint, the order of Chief United States Circuit Judge William H. Pryor Jr., and the petition for review filed by petitioner. No judge on this panel has requested that this matter be placed on the agenda of a meeting of the Judicial Council.

The Judicial Council Review Panel hereby AFFIRMS the disposition of this matter by Chief Judge Pryor. The petition for review is DENIED.

Done this 25th day of August, 2025.

FOR THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL:

/s/ Robin S. Rosenbaum

United States Circuit Judge

JUN 02 2025

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90086

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 filed a counseled employment-discrimination complaint against a company, and after various proceedings, she filed a second amended complaint. Complainant’s counsel then moved to withdraw from representing her, and after a hearing, the Subject Judge granted the motion to withdraw and denied Complainant’s motion for appointment of counsel.

At a hearing on a motion to compel that Complainant had filed, the Subject Judge questioned Complainant about her

previous testimony that a paralegal informed her that she did not need to file a subpoena with the court. After Complainant testified, the Subject Judge stated, “You are a very bad liar,” and, “You’re a very bad liar.” Near the end of the hearing, the Subject Judge stated, “I’ve given you more than enough time to state your position. I don’t think that it benefits you to say anything more because, A, I’m not changing my mind, and B, you cannot stop saying things that are not true.” The Subject Judge denied the motion to compel.

The defendant later filed an amended motion for summary judgment, and the Subject Judge directed the clerk to refer the matter for mediation. The Subject Judge then entered an opinion and order granting the defendant’s motion for summary judgment. Complainant filed a motion for reconsideration, which the Subject Judge denied.

Complaint

Complainant contends the Subject Judge did not rule in the light most favorable to her, relied on false evidence and hearsay, failed to rule on objections and a motion for sanctions, failed to provide a legitimate reason for allowing her attorneys to withdraw, overlooked and misinterpreted evidence, and violated the Code of Conduct for United States Judges. Complainant also alleges the Subject Judge collaborated with the defendant, showed the defendant favoritism, “seemed to be under the defendant’s influence,” overlooked the defendant’s obstruction and false testimony, was biased and prejudiced against her, treated her unfairly, discriminated against her, and retaliated against her.

Complainant contends the Subject Judge abused and humiliated her by falsely calling her a “bad liar,” falsely stated that she gave inconsistent testimony, and disrespected her by stating that a motion for reconsideration “should not be a knee-jerk reaction to an adverse action.” She asserts that, during mediation, she felt pressure to accept a settlement, and the mediator stated, ““If you do not accept this settlement [the Subject Judge] will toss your case.”” She also takes issue with the conduct of other individuals.

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, was biased or otherwise not impartial, discriminated or retaliated against her, treated her in a demonstrably egregious and hostile manner, made false statements, violated the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, 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