

SEP 17 2025

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-25-90164 through 11-25-90172

ORDER

An individual has filed a Complaint against five United States district judges and five United States magistrate judges 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 Judges have been assigned to multiple civil cases Complainant filed.

Complaint

Complainant alleges that the Subject Judges engaged in a “coordinated pattern of judicial bias, violation of due process, and deliberate obstruction of access to the courts in multiple cases,” engaged in a “systematic campaign to deny” him meaningful access to justice, repeatedly denied him *in forma pauperis* status despite

clear evidence of his indigence, unlawfully dismissed meritorious claims without permitting amendment, failed to recuse despite clear evidence of personal bias and prejudgment, ignored and struck motions to recuse, [c]oordinated reassignment of cases between themselves to perpetrate bias,” engaged in “retaliatory judicial shopping,” treated him with “judicial hostility,” and issued orders that “mirror each other in language,” which indicated a “concerted effort to block” his claims.

Complainant states that one of the Subject Judges denied his *in forma pauperis* motion and dismissed a case “ignoring evidence of imminent harm to Trust assts,” and another Subject Judge adopted a “prejudiced” report and recommendation without conducting a *de novo* review. He attached documents to his Complaint. In one attachment, he alleges the Subject Judges “[w]eaponized procedural rules” to “stall, delay, or block access to justice,” retaliated against him for exposing misconduct, and “fast-tracked rulings on motions shielding the judiciary, while ignoring valid filings with legal merit.” In another attachment, he alleges the Subject Judges suppressed his filings by marking them “docketed in error” without legal cause and caused in “delays and obstruction” that directly harmed a minor child in his care.

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 Judges’ official actions, findings, rulings, reports, recommendations, and orders in Complainant’s cases, the allegations are directly related to the merits of the Subject Judges’ 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 Judges acted with an illicit or improper motive, were biased or otherwise not impartial, improperly reassigned cases, retaliated against him, treated him in a demonstrably egregious and hostile manner, 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