

APR 22 2026

CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Judicial Council of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-26-90028 and 11-26-90029

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 22nd day of April, 2026.

FOR THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL:

/s/ Robin S. Rosenbaum

United States Circuit Judge

FEB 19 2026

CONFIDENTIAL

David J. Smith
Clerk

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-26-90028 and 11-26-90029

ORDER

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

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 an amended civil complaint against multiple defendants, the defendants moved to dismiss it, and Complainant moved to strike one of the motions to dismiss. The Subject Magistrate Judge issued a report recommending that the motions to dismiss be granted because some claims were barred by *res judicata* and the complaint otherwise

failed to state a claim on which relief could be granted. Over Complainant's objections, the Subject District Judge adopted the report and recommendation. This Court affirmed. While the appeal was pending, the case was reassigned to a different district judge.

Complaint

Complainant alleges the Subject Judges violated the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, have no respect for the law, "failed to avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety," served as *de facto* counsel for the defendants, discriminated against him because he was proceeding *pro se*, obstructed justice, failed to maintain professional competence in the law, violated the United States Constitution, and sought to "provoke, antagonize, harass, cause unnecessary delay and needlessly increase the cost of litigation." He states there may have been *ex parte* communications between the Subject Judges and the defendants, and he asserts that the Subject District Judge's removal from his case shows that she engaged in misconduct.

Complainant alleges the Subject Magistrate Judge "has practiced excessively egregious hostile treatment, partisan acts (as *de facto* counsel) and abuse of authority," "demonstrated an enthusiastic failure to perform her sworn duty," and "has willfully with malicious intent inflicted immeasurable" harm on him. Complainant also states the Subject Magistrate Judge "was the engineer and architect of the invidious and Satanic conspiracy against" him.

Supplements

In his first supplemental filing, Complainant alleges the Subject Judges “are unfit and unable to discharge any and all duties of office by reason of mental disability,” specifically an “intellectual disability” the prevents their ability to act with “good behavior.” He alleges the Subject Judges failed to faithfully and impartially discharge the duties of their office. He also alleges the Subject Magistrate Judge intentionally failed to mail him documents. He attached documents. In his second supplemental filing, Complainant reiterates his allegations and contends that the Subject Judges were part of a conspiracy to circumvent clearly established law.

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, report, recommendations, and orders in the above-described case, 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, treated him in a demonstrably egregious and hostile manner, were part of a conspiracy, engaged in improper *ex parte* communications, violated the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, suffered from a disability, 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