

OCT 29 2025

CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Judicial Council of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90153

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 29 day of October, 2025.

FOR THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL:

/s/ Robin S. Rosenbaum

United States Circuit Judge

AUG. 28 2025

**David J. Smith
Clerk**

CONFIDENTIAL

**Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit**

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90153

ORDER

Two individuals have 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 Complainants filed their Complaint, they filed four supplements. The filing of the supplement is permitted. *See* 11th Cir. JCDR 6.7.

Background

The record establishes that Complainants filed a civil complaint against multiple defendants, and some defendants moved to reassign the case as related to a prior case Complainants had filed. A district judge granted the motion to reassign and transferred the case to the Subject Judge. The defendants then filed a motion for judgment on the pleadings.

Afterward, Complainants filed an amended complaint in which they named the Subject Judge as an additional defendant. The Subject Judge later entered orders ruling on certain motions, and the United States Attorney filed a motion to dismiss the Subject Judge from the case. The Subject Judge issued orders ruling on various motions, including an order granting the motion to dismiss him from the case. The Subject Judge ruled that the amended complaint was a nullity, the United States Attorney was not properly served, and the Subject Judge had absolute judicial immunity. The Subject Judge also entered orders granting another defendant's motion to dismiss and granting the remaining defendants' motion for judgment on the pleadings. This Court affirmed.

The Subject Judge later granted the defendants summary judgment on their counterclaim. The order also found that the Complainants had filed baseless and unintelligible documents and raised "outrageous and fanciful" claims. The order enjoined them from filing any further papers in the case or any new lawsuit against the defendants raising similar claims without leave of the Subject Judge. Years later, Complainants filed motions seeking various types of relief, and the Subject Judge denied the motions because they were filed without permission.

Complaint

Complainants initially allege the case was improperly assigned to the Subject Judge based on a request by the defendants. They allege the Subject Judge had a conflict of interest with one defendant because an individual "believed to be" the Subject

Judge's relative starred in the defendant's television series, which was produced and aired during the pendency of the case. They contend the connection "raised grave concerns of bias, improper influence, and potential bribery," and they complain that the Subject Judge failed to recuse himself from the case.

Complainants further allege that the Subject Judge issued orders on moot motions, ruled on motions while named as a defendant, failed to rule on certain motions, summarily ruled on motions without addressing the merits, failed to transmit documents to the appellate court, issued orders in the absence of jurisdiction, concealed that the defendants were in default, misconstrued their pleadings, issued a filing injunction "contrary to Supreme Court law," allowed the defendants to engage in "procedural manipulation," prevented them from accessing certain documents, and "repeatedly used and adopted the defense's pejorative language in his orders," which was unprofessional, demonstrated bias, and violated the Code of Conduct for United States Judges. They allege the Subject Judge's "pattern" of behavior demonstrated that he colluded with defense counsel to block substantive review of their filings and obstruct their access to the court. They also raise allegations against others and contend the "district and appellate courts" omitted from lists of related cases their petition for writ of mandamus, which "concealed the full scope of our efforts and distorted the procedural history." They attached documents to their Complaint.

Supplements

In their first supplemental filing, Complainants state they seek to “clarify and correct the record concerning recent filings, docket labeling, party/counsel status, and to provide an updated transaction history pertinent to the pending appeal and related motions.” In the second, they seek to “clarify and correct the record regarding the prior Judicial Complaint submission and to address the transmission of documents to the appellate court” in two appeals.

In the third, Complainants reiterate their allegations, contend the Subject Judge improperly invoked *res judicata* and collateral estoppel, and allege the Subject Judge engaged in a “premeditated, strategic use of judicial power to favor defense counsel and to deprive Plaintiffs of their right to have all claims adjudicated on the merits.” In the fourth, Complainants allege the district court terminated all cases on the docket while certain claims remained pending, improperly dismissed a defendant, misused “preclusion doctrines,” and committed a fraud upon the court.

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 Complainants’ 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). Complainants’ 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, colluded with others, accepted bribes, treated Complainants in a demonstrably egregious and hostile manner, committed fraud upon the court, 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