

AUG. 21 2025

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90148

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 an individual, purportedly through his next friend, filed a civil complaint against multiple defendants. The Subject Judge dismissed the complaint for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction.

Complaint

Complainant first alleges that the “Eleventh Circuit as a whole has demonstrated systemic failures in disability access,” there is “[n]o clear ADA communication protocol for pro se or

disabled litigants,” there is “[n]o designated ADA coordinator or emergency contact for urgent civil rights matters,” and there are “[c]onsistent delays in docketing and refusal to act on properly submitted motions by disabled veterans and their legal advocates.” With respect to the above-described case, Complainant asserts that the “record clearly shows that” the Subject Judge “engaged in retaliatory, dismissive conduct, including twice dismissing the case without protecting the plaintiff’s constitutional or statutory rights,” retaliated against the plaintiff’s “nephew and legal advocate,” failed to docket or rule on motions, “engaged in acts to strike critical documents from the record, obstructing oversight and future review,” “enabled further theft by unauthorized fiduciaries,” and violated statutes, cases, and the due-process clause of the United States Constitution.

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.

Furthermore, Judicial-Conduct Rule 4(b)(2) provides that cognizable misconduct does not include “an allegation about delay in rendering a decision or ruling, unless the allegation concerns an improper motive in delaying a particular decision or habitual delay in a significant number of unrelated cases.” The “Commentary on Rule 4” states that “a complaint of delay in a single case is excluded as 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 anyone, 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