

JUL 17 2026

CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Judicial Council of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-26-90063 and 11-26-90064

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 17th day of July, 2026.

FOR THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL:

/s/ Robin S. Rosenbaum

United States Circuit Judge

APR 10 2026

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-26-90063 and 11-26-90064

ORDER

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

Background

The record establishes that Complainant filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus, 28 U.S.C. § 2254, challenging state court convictions. The Subject Magistrate Judge issued a report recommending that the petition be dismissed without prejudice for lack of exhaustion, and the Subject District Judge adopted the report and recommendation.

The record also establishes that Complainant filed another habeas petition. The Subject Magistrate Judge issued a report

recommending that the petition be dismissed as untimely. Complainant then moved to compel discovery. The Subject District Judge adopted the report and recommendation and stated that none of Complainant's filings raised any type of objection. Afterward, Complainant filed additional motions, which the Subject District Judge denied.

Complaint

Complainant alleges the Subject Judges were part of a conspiracy to commit fraud, falsely imprison him, and prevent him from testifying against another individual. He alleges the Subject District Judge had *ex parte* communications with a district attorney, was blackmailed by the district attorney, committed crimes, intentionally failed to comply with rules and precedent, and falsely stated that he did not file objections to a report and recommendation. 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.

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, reports, recommendations, 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 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, had improper *ex parte* communications, were blackmailed, 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