

SEP 15 2025

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90162

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 an individual, as the executor of an estate, filed a *pro se* second amended civil complaint against multiple defendants. After the case was reassigned to the Subject Judge, certain defendants filed a motion to dismiss the complaint and a motion to stay discovery, and the Subject Judge granted the motion to stay.

After additional filings, the Subject Judge entered an order finding it was necessary for the plaintiff to obtain a lawyer to represent her as executor of the estate, directing her to obtain

representation or show cause why the case should not be dismissed for lack of representation, and stating the court would defer ruling on any pending motions until the representation issue was resolved. Certain defendants then filed a motion to stay the deadline to file a response to the plaintiff's various filings, and the Subject Judge granted the motion. The case remains pending.

Complaint

Complainant alleges that in the above-described case, the Subject Judge violated the Code of Conduct for United States Judges and was biased in favor of, had *ex parte* communications with, and improperly coordinated with the defendants and their counsel. She complains that the Subject Judge granted a motion the defendants filed on the same day it was filed, without giving the plaintiff an opportunity to respond. Complainant contends that the Subject Judge "contradicted her own directive" by ruling on a motion after stating she would defer ruling on motions until the plaintiff secured counsel, which called her impartiality into question and required her recusal.

Complainant alleges the Subject Judge refused to address motions concerning fraudulent filings, forged or misleading evidence, and "bar violations" by law firms, which constituted a dereliction of her duty under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 11 to ensure pleadings are not used to mislead or harass litigants. Complainant states that the Subject Judge's "pattern of dismissing and disregarding serious constitutional claims and criminal fraud

accusations without review creates the appearance that she is shielding defendants from accountability”

Complainant states that a defendant filed a motion “suggesting concern about Plaintiff’s exposing the state’s complicity in the events” involved in the case, and alleges that the Subject Judge’s “immediate acceptance of that motion, in concert with a refusal to acknowledge the fraud filings, suggests collusion and retaliation in violation of Plaintiff’s First Amendment right to petition the government for redress.” Complainant complains that the Subject Judge ordered the plaintiff to obtain counsel after almost a year and only after the plaintiff “blew the whistle on the systemic fraud and cover-up” in the case, which created an appearance of retaliation. Finally, Complainant alleges the Subject Judge permitted a defendant to present false certificates of service and failed to address “serious irregularities by the Clerk’s Office.”

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, colluded or conspired with anyone, had improper *ex parte* communications, retaliated against the plaintiff, 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