

JAN 29 2026

CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Judicial Council of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90160

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 29th day of January, 2026.

FOR THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL:

/s/ Robin S. Rosenbaum

United States Circuit Judge

SEP 11 2025

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90160

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 the Subject Judge has been assigned to multiple cases filed by Complainant. In one case, Complainant filed a civil complaint against multiple defendants and a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*. A magistrate judge granted the motion and directed the clerk to submit the complaint to the Subject Judge for a frivolity determination. The case remains pending.

Complaint

Complainant alleges the Subject Judge acted in concert with others “to orchestrate a systemic cover-up of crimes and constitutional violations committed against” her family. She alleges the “conspiracy includes” dismissing cases without notice or hearing, deliberately mischaracterizing her claims and evidence, denying motions without justification, giving favorable treatment to non-parties and unserved defendants, manipulating the docket and withholding transcripts to deny her appellate rights, and facilitating “retaliatory conduct” against her as a “whistleblower and recognized international human rights defender.”

Complainant asserts that she has evidence that the Subject Judge violated the United States Constitution, various statutes, and federal ethical and disciplinary standards. She alleges the Subject Judge acted with “actual bias, prejudice, and retaliatory intent,” violated the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, and issued rulings containing “conclusory and derogatory statements impugning my integrity and minimizing the severe injuries suffered by my family.”

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 Complainant’s 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 or otherwise not impartial, was part of a conspiracy, treated her in a demonstrably egregious and hostile manner, knowingly made false statements, 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