

OCT 9 2025

CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Judicial Council of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90096

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 9th day of October, 2025.

FOR THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL:

/s/ Robin S. Rosenbaum

United States Circuit Judge

JUL 02 2025

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90096

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.

As an initial matter, after Complainant filed his Complaint, he filed a supplemental statement. The filing of the supplemental statement is permitted. *See* 11th Cir. JCDR 6.7.

Background

The record establishes that Complainant, as “General Executor” of an “estate-trust,” filed a civil complaint against multiple defendants. He also filed an emergency motion for a temporary restraining order seeking to enjoin the defendants from enforcing a foreclosure judgment. The Subject Judge issued an opinion and order denying the motion for injunctive relief and dismissing the

complaint, in part on the ground that the complaint was “grounded in frivolous ‘sovereign citizen’ allegations.” Complainant then filed a motion to vacate the Subject Judge’s opinion and order, and the Subject Judge denied the motion and stated that further frivolous filings could result in sanctions.

Supplement

Complainant’s supplement is composed of various documents.

Complaint

Complainant alleges the Subject Judge acted without jurisdiction, committed “judicial trespass” against a private estate, violated her oath of office, fraudulently mischaracterized pleadings, falsely labeled him a “sovereign citizen,” acted with an improper motive by erroneously referring to him as a “*pro se* litigant,” willfully disregarded evidence, was grossly negligent, failed to hold a required evidentiary hearing, threatened to sanction him without due process, engaged in “judicial coercion,” engaged in “deceptive judicial practice” by citing unrelated cases and misapplying cases, obstructed justice, entered into “an adversarial and hostile posture against” him, engaged in personal attacks, made defamatory statements, violated his constitutional rights, and committed crimes.

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, opinions, 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 engaged in misconduct. Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D). For these reasons, this Complaint is **DISMISSED**.

/s/ William H. Pryor Jr.
Chief Judge