

AUG. 21 2025

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-25-90143 through 11-25-90146

ORDER

An individual has filed a Complaint against one United States district judge and three United States circuit judges 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 civil complaint against multiple defendants and a motion seeking relief in connection with a guardianship proceeding. The Subject District Judge issued an order denying the motion and dismissing the complaint as frivolous. The order also reflected that Complainant was a lawyer, but that a review of a state database showed that she was suspended from practicing in that state. Complainant filed multiple unsuccessful motions for reconsideration and motions to vacate. On appeal, a panel composed of the Subject Circuit Judges granted

a motion for summary affirmance two appellees had filed and affirmed the district court's denial of Complainant's post-judgment motions. The opinion also stated that Complainant was an attorney, but that according to a state database, she was currently suspended.

Complaint

Complainant alleges that the Subject District Judge entered an unconstitutional order containing a fraudulent statement that she had been admitted to, and disbarred from, the bar of a certain state. She contends the order was entered without providing her with due process or an opportunity to respond. She also complains that the Subject District Judge "put incriminating documents under seal *sua sponte* during the motion for reconsideration"

Complainant alleges the Subject Circuit Judges "admit they copied fraudulent documents off the Internet," and she states "judges cannot take hearsay off the Internet, nor can judges accept forged *ex parte* documents – whether federal or state – without ordering service on the adversary." She also takes issue with the actions of other individuals, and she attached documents to her 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 Judges’ official actions, findings, rulings, orders, and opinion in the above-described case and appeal, the allegations are directly related to the merits of the Subject Judges’ 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 Judges acted with an illicit or improper motive 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