

DEC 10 2025

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-25-90249 through 11-25-90252

ORDER

An individual has filed a Complaint against three United States district judges and one 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 his Complaint, he filed two 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, an amended complaint, and motions seeking various types of relief. The Subject Magistrate Judge issued orders ruling on certain motions. The case remains pending.

The record establishes that Complainant filed another civil complaint naming, among others, the First and Second Subject District Judges and the Subject Magistrate Judge as defendants. After the Third Subject District Judge entered an order in the case, Complainant filed an amended complaint adding the Third Subject District Judge as a defendant, and the judge recused herself from the case. After additional proceedings, the Second Subject District Judge entered an order directing the clerk to randomly reassign the case. A district judge who is not one of the Subject Judges then dismissed the case.

The record also establishes that Complainant filed in another court a civil complaint against a government agency. The other court then transferred the case to the Subject Judges' court, and the First Subject District Judge and Subject Magistrate Judge were assigned to the case. The First Subject District Judge then entered an initial order concerning case management and deadlines. The judge later issued an order directing Complainant to show cause why he did not comply with the initial order and local rules by filing a Notice of Pendency of Related Actions and Disclosure Statement. After the deadline to respond passed, the judge entered an order dismissing case for failure to comply with the show-cause order.

Complaint

Complainant states that his Complaint "arises from a pattern of structural conflicts, judicial misconduct, and constitutional violations stemming from" his cases. He alleges one of his cases was

“reassigned within the same district” despite that he named multiple judges and court officers as defendants in the case. He contends that “[t]his occurred despite clear ethical and statutory mandates under 28 U.S.C. § 455(a) which require disqualification when a judge’s impartiality ‘might reasonably be questioned.’” Complainant states that a judge who is not one of the Subject Judges recused himself from a case, “implicitly recognizing the conflict,” but that the Second Subject District Judge “reassigned the case within the same district, despite acknowledging that all listed defendants were from that district.”

Complainant alleges that the Third Subject District Judge was named as a defendant in one case, but continued to issue rulings in the case “without disclosing her conflict” in violation of Canon 3C of the Code of Conduct for United States Judges. He states that a petition he filed in another jurisdiction was transferred to the court in violation of a certain statutory provision, and he alleges that the First Subject District Judge and the Subject Magistrate Judge accepted the case and issued orders despite challenges to the transfer pending in another court and the United States Supreme Court. Finally, Complainant contends that, in another case, the court “actively disregarded a tolling directive issued by the Eleventh Circuit, an action that undermines appellate supervision and exhibits contempt for procedural due process.”

Supplements

In the first supplemental filing, Complainant alleges the First Subject District Judge dismissed a case in retaliation for

Complainant filing this Complaint against him. Complainant states the dismissal occurred within one week of his filing of the Complaint, the dismissal “did not address the core jurisdictional issue raised in the case,” and his filings with other courts “were already served on [the First Subject District Judge] prior to this retaliatory action.” Complainant alleges the First Subject District Judge lacked authority to dismiss the case and was aware of certain “on going proceedings ... thereby effectively interfering with those proceedings and reinforcing the appearance of retaliatory judicial behavior.”

In the second supplemental filing, Complainant raises allegations of misconduct against a clerk, and he requests that an investigation be conducted to determine “whether this interference was ordered, directed, or condoned by” the Second Subject District Judge.

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 Judges' official actions, findings, rulings, and orders in his 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, had a conflict of interest, retaliated against him, 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