

APR 3 2026

CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Judicial Council of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-25-90289 and 11-25-90290

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 3rd day of April, 2026.

FOR THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL:

/s/ Robin S. Rosenbaum

United States Circuit Judge

JAN 22 2026

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-25-90289 and 11-25-90290

ORDER

An individual has filed a Complaint against two United States district 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 Complainant filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus, 28 U.S.C. § 2254, and the First Subject Judge ordered that the petition be transferred to another district court. Complainant later moved for reconsideration and for “protection” and moved for relief from judgment, both of which the First Subject Judge denied. In the transferred case, the Second Subject Judge entered an order dismissing Complainant’s petition as an unauthorized successive petition because Complainant filed a previous petition that was dismissed as untimely.

Complaint

Complainant takes issue with the Subject Judge's orders in the above-described cases, and he alleges that the Subject Judges conspired with state officials to make a "false statement and relied on such statement to perpetrate miscarriage of justice on" him. He alleges that the Second Subject Judge falsely stated that his first habeas petition was untimely. He also alleges that the Second Subject Judge and a prosecutor "were overtly plot[t]ing" to deny his petition and motions while he was being denied access to a law library. Complainant complains that the First Subject Judge denied his motion for protection despite that it was missing pages.

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 the above-described 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 part of a conspiracy, 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