

AUG. 21 2025

David J. Smith  
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the  
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

---

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90149

---

**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 civil complaint against a corporation, and the defendant removed the case to federal court and moved to dismiss it. Complainant moved to remand. The Subject Judge granted the motion to dismiss, denied the motion to remand, and gave Complainant an opportunity to amend her complaint. Complainant then filed an amended complaint naming a different corporate defendant and another motion to remand, and the Subject Judge denied the motion to remand.

Complainant filed a “Motion for Certification of Interlocutory Appeal,” and the Subject Judge entered an order denying the motion and cautioning her that monetary sanctions may be imposed if she multiplied the proceedings unreasonably and vexatiously. Complainant then filed several motions for various types of relief, including a motion for referral to a voluntary attorney program. The Subject Judge entered an order denying Complainant’s motions and directing her to show cause why she should not be sanctioned for failing to comply with court orders.

### **Complaint**

Complainant alleges the Subject Judge had a conflict of interest and created an appearance of impropriety because he previously worked as chief legal officer for a company, which involved “close dealings with insurance and risk firms,” and the defendant was owned by a subsidiary of such a firm. Complainant contends the Subject Judge’s failure to recuse and failure to disclose his “prior relationship” raised “serious ethical concerns about the appearance of bias.”

Complainant alleges the Subject Judge “demonstrated bias and lack of impartiality in both words and actions during this case,” “adopted a derogatory characterization of the pro se plaintiff’s filings as ‘vexatious,’” “repeatedly ruled in favor of the defense without fair consideration of the plaintiff’s positions,” exhibited conduct towards her that was “unduly harsh and procedurally irregular in a manner that suggests favoritism towards the defense,” resolved multiple motions without awaiting the defendant’s response

“indicating a predetermined outcome,” denied her request for counsel “despite her evident challenges as a pro se litigant,” inappropriately admonished her, “preemptively” threatened her with sanctions, and violated the Code of Conduct for United States Judges. 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 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, had a conflict of interest, treated her in a demonstrably egregious and hostile manner, 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