

AUG. 25 2025

CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Judicial Council of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90087

ORDER

Before: ROSENBAUM, NEWSOM, and BRANCH, Circuit Judges; MARKS 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 04 2025

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90087

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 in state court a *pro se* civil complaint against multiple defendants, and a defendant removed the case to federal court. Complainant later filed an amended complaint, and two defendants filed motions to dismiss. After a hearing, the Subject Judge entered an order stating that Complainant failed to appear at the hearing and granting the motions to dismiss. Complainant then filed a motion objecting to the hearing, which the Subject Judge denied. Complainant filed a

motion for reconsideration. After another hearing, the Subject Judge again granted the defendants' motions to dismiss.

Complaint

Complainant alleges the Subject Judge used his office to obtain special treatment for friends or relatives, conspired with the opposing parties "to steal this case," acted with an improper motive, disregarded and undermined his arguments, improperly made him "the subject matter in the case," obstructed justice, gave misleading information, treated others in a hostile manner, exhibited "rude attitudes to due process," discriminated against him, engaged in "theft by extortion," abused his position, and was biased against *pro se* litigants. Complainant also takes issue with the conduct of other individuals, and he alleges the court engaged in "rogue schemes and rigging the mail."

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, used his office to obtain special treatment for others, discriminated against Complainant, was part of conspiracy, treated anyone in a demonstrably egregious or hostile manner, 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