

APR 08 2026

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-26-90058 through 11-26-90060

ORDER

An individual has filed a Complaint against three United States circuit 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 in state court a civil complaint against multiple defendants, and the defendants removed the case to federal court. Complainant appealed the order denying his motion to remand, and a panel composed of the Subject Judges dismissed the appeal for lack of jurisdiction. Complainant later filed notices of appeal of additional orders entered by the district court, and the appeals were consolidated. Complainant moved to recuse the Subject Judges, and a panel composed of the Subject Judges denied the motion. The defendants moved for

summary affirmance, and after additional filings, this Court issued an order directing the clerk's office to take no action on any new motions Complainant filed until the Court rules on the summary-affirmance motions. The appeals remain pending.

Complaint

Complainant alleges the Subject Judges retaliated against him for filing a motion to recuse, assisted staff members in failing to perform their duties in good faith, "systematically [p]rofiled" him, violated his constitutional and civil rights, acted with an illicit or improper motive, violated the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, failed to preserve the integrity and independence of the judiciary, treated him in a demonstrably egregious and hostile manner, knowingly lent the prestige of the judicial office to advance the private interests of certain organizations, were members of organizations that practiced invidious discrimination, issued an order that was "swayed by partisan interests, public clamor, and feared criticism," failed to maintain order and decorum in the proceedings, failed to take appropriate action upon receipt of information that others engaged in misconduct, were biased, showed favoritism, acted "inappropriately due to personal interests," accepted "illegal favors," were incompetent, failed to give him sufficient time to respond, interfered with his right to seek review of orders, falsified orders, failed to process or delayed processing his pleadings, and failed to provide him notice of orders. He also takes issue with the actions of other individuals, and he attached documents to his Complaint.

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, rulings,

determinations, and orders in Complainant's appeals, 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 engaged in misconduct. Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D). For these reasons, this Complaint is **DISMISSED**.

/s/ William H. Pryor Jr.
Chief Judge