

JUL 17 2026

CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Judicial Council of the  
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

---

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-26-90083 through 11-26-90085

---

**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

MAY 19 2026

David J. Smith  
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the  
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

---

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-26-90083 through 11-26-90085

---

**ORDER**

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

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 three cases. The Subject Magistrate Judge issued in each case a report recommending that the case be dismissed. In two cases, the First Subject District Judge adopted the reports and recommendations, and in the third case, the Second Subject District Judge adopted the report and recommendation.

## **Complaint**

Complainant alleges the Subject Judges acted with improper motives, questions the legal basis for various rulings and orders, complains about delay in the cases, contends the Subject Judges failed to comply with statutes and rules, states her access to mail has been obstructed, and raises allegations against other individuals and entities.

## **Supplements**

Complainant's supplements include or reference case filings.

## **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, reports, recommendations, and orders in Complainant’s 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 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