

APR 3 2026

CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Judicial Council of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-26-90009 through 11-26-90011

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

FEB 05 2026

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-26-90009 through 11-26-90011

ORDER

An individual has filed a Complaint against a United States district judge and two 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.

As an initial matter, after Complainant filed her Complaint, she filed two supplements. The filing of the supplements is permitted. *See* 11th Cir. JCDR 6.7.

Background

The record establishes that Complainant filed a *pro se* “Emergency Verified Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, Injunctive Relief, and Immediate Return of Minor Child to Lawful Custody” and an emergency motion for injunctive relief. The First Subject Magistrate Judge denied her request for emergency consideration.

Complainant then moved for access to the court's electronic-filing system and for other relief.

The First Subject Magistrate Judge entered an order stating that a party who continued to file papers in the case after 14 days without moving for case reassignment would be deemed to have consented to the magistrate judge exercising jurisdiction over the case. The First Subject Magistrate Judge later entered an order stating that it appeared Complainant's claims stemmed from a "custody battle" and denying her petition and motions. With respect to Complainant's request for electronic filing, the First Subject Magistrate Judge contacted the "CM/ECF desk" and was told that *pro se* filers were not allowed access to the electronic-filing system.

The record also establishes that Complainant filed a civil complaint against multiple defendants and moved for various types of relief, including accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act. The case remains pending.

Complaint

Complainant states that the Subject Judges were aware of her disabilities but failed to provide her reasonable accommodations, to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act, and "to supervise or enforce court accessibility obligations." She contends that, in both cases, there was "[u]nreasonable delay and non-adjudication of emergency matters involving disabled access," she was effectively denied access to the courts, and she and her family were endangered. She also takes issue with the First Subject Magistrate Judge's order denying her motion for electronic filing.

Supplements

Complainant's first supplement includes documents in which she alleges the First Subject Magistrate Judge denied her access to the court, deliberately mischaracterized her filings and the record, misrepresented the "governing authority" over electronic filing, failed to rule on motions, violated her due-process rights, and acted without jurisdiction. In her second supplement, Complainant states she is providing additional materials "solely for contextual review and record completeness" and that the materials concern delay, "record discrepancies and missing judicial records," and failure to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

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, 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, made misrepresentations, 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