

SEP 09 2025

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90159

ORDER

An individual has filed a Complaint against a United States magistrate 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 her Complaint, she filed three supplements. The filing of the supplements is permitted. *See* 11th Cir. JCDR 6.7.

Background

The record establishes that Complainant filed a civil complaint against multiple defendants, a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*, and multiple notices. The Subject Judge entered an order denying the *in forma pauperis* motion because it was incomplete. Complainant then filed a second *in forma pauperis* motion, and the Subject Judge entered an order denying the motion, stating that it

appeared the action may be barred by the fugitive-disentitlement doctrine and that most of the defendants may have prosecutorial and judicial immunity, directing Complainant to pay the entire filing fee because she refused to supply sufficient information for the court to assess her financial situation, and stating she may contact the clerk about the various ways payment may be accepted.

A third *in forma pauperis* motion was docketed, and the Subject Judge entered an order denying the motion as duplicative and directed Complainant to avoid filing duplicative papers. Complainant then filed a motion for extension of time to pay the filing fee and for the court to provide payment instructions. The Subject Judge entered an order granting the motion for extension of time in part and denying any request to pay the filing fee by remote means. The case remains pending.

Complaint

Complainant alleges the Subject Judge unjustifiably failed to rule on her motion to pay the fee remotely for over three weeks, which denied her access to the courts and created a threat of dismissal without an opportunity to be heard. She asserts the “pattern of inaction compounds prior misconduct,” and that she has faced “additional procedural obstruction, including denial of guidance on e-payment instructions and prolonged inaction on my motion to pay the filing fee remotely.” She states, “The cumulative effect of these state and federal court actions effectively blocks me from pursuing legal remedies, punishes me for exercising my legal rights, and constitutes both retaliatory bias and systemic obstruction.”

Supplements

In her first supplemental filing, Complainant reiterates her allegations concerning delay, alleging inaction on her motion obstructed her access to the court and violated her constitutional rights.

In the second supplement, Complainant alleges the Subject Judge engaged in a “deliberate pattern of judicial obstruction, procedural suppression, and retaliatory tactics.” She complains about delay in assigning a case number and alleges the case is “hidden from public view on the PACER system” because it is being “manually manipulated.” She alleges the Subject Judge denied her *in forma pauperis* motions without substantive explanation, imposed burdensome procedural requirements, ignored her motion to pay remotely, retaliated against her by implementing a rule prohibiting *pro se* plaintiffs from e-filing new complaints, deliberately suppressed filings by refusing to docket them, showed bias by introducing substantive defenses on behalf of the defendants, “deliberately mis-captioned” multiple filings, accepted and docketed “hearsay information as fact” to discredit her, docketed a “false filing” on her behalf, and denied her due process rights.

In the third supplement, Complainant states that the court has “completed ceased accepting” her filings in violation of her constitutional rights, and she complains about delay in ruling on her motion for remote payment.

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, was biased or otherwise not impartial, retaliated against her, 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