

AUG. 25 2025

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90151

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 supplement. The filing of the supplement is permitted. *See* 11th Cir. JCDR 6.7.

Background

The record establishes that after being assigned four civil complaints filed by Complainant, the Subject Judge issued orders dismissing all four cases. Years later, a letter Complainant wrote to a different judge was docketed in each of the four cases. In the letter, Complainant requested a writ of mandamus pertaining to the four closed cases. In each case, the Subject Judge issued an order

denying Complainant's request for mandamus relief because the cases were closed and he was not entitled to relief. The order also directed the clerk to treat any additional correspondence pertaining to the four closed cases as a letter or notice as opposed to a formal motion.

Complaint

Complainant alleges the Subject Judge entered an order in a case to which he was not assigned. He contends the Subject Judge should have required the defendants to file answers in the cases. He states he "was harmed by [the Subject Judge] permitting a Rule 6 violation to deprive [him] of his Civil Rights." He also alleges the Subject Judge held him to a "Professional Attorney standard" and showed bias in favor of the defendants by not requiring them to file answers. Finally, Complainant states the filing of the Subject Judge's order in a different case "attempts to improperly opine, and apply undue influence upon the proceedings, and usurp and undermine Authority upon another Judge's active case"

Supplement

In a supplemental filing, Complainant reiterates his allegations and states that the Subject Judge issued his order in an improper venue, his finding that Complainant's cases were frivolous was "unfounded," and he participated in a conspiracy to deprive Complainant of access to justice. He attached documents to his supplement.

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 cases, 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, was part of a conspiracy, 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