

APR 16 2026

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-26-90068 and 11-26-90069

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 three civil complaints against multiple defendants. In one case, the Subject Magistrate Judge struck certain filings due to Complainant's failure to comply with a local rule and gave him seven days to file compliant documents. In each case, Complainant moved to reassign the case, which the Subject District Judge denied. The cases remain pending.

Complaint

Complainant alleges that in his cases the court “imposed a compressed deadline exclusively on the pro se plaintiff,” which “forfeited a specific procedural right” and benefitted the defendants. He takes issue with court-ordered deadlines, and he contends that the court failed to account for delay in mailing, treated him more harshly than the defendants, overlooked deficiencies in the defendants’ motions, and threatened him with dismissal. He attached a document 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, 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'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 not impartial, 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