

MAY 19 2026

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-26-90087

ORDER

An individual has filed a Complaint against 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.

Background

The record establishes that Complainant and a company filed an amended patent-infringement complaint against multiple defendants and motions to proceed *in forma pauperis* and for injunctive relief. The Subject Judge denied the motion for injunctive relief and stated that any such motion must comply with the applicable rules and that a corporation could not proceed without an attorney. The Subject Judge then denied the *in forma pauperis* motion and dismissed the case.

The record also establishes that three entities filed a trademark-infringement action against multiple defendants and an *ex parte* motion for a temporary restraining order and other relief. The Subject Judge granted the motion in part and denied it in part. Complainant then filed an emergency motion to intervene as a defendant, and the Subject Judge denied it on the grounds that she failed to claim an interest relating to the property that was the subject of the action and failed to comply with applicable rules. Complainant then moved for a temporary restraining order, which the Subject Judge denied because the motion failed to comply with local rules and her motion to intervene had been denied. The case is closed.

Complaint

Complainant “allege[s] a pattern of demonstrable bias and disparate treatment in the administration of” the two above-described cases. She alleges the Subject Judge “utilized hyper-technical procedural enforcement to silence a *pro se* inventor while simultaneously failing to uphold basic standards of candor for corporate counsel who have made material misrepresentation of[sic] the Court.” Complainant contends the Subject Judge applied a “Double Standard” that undermined the integrity of the judiciary and held her to a “standard of ‘perfect formatting,’ where minor clerical errors result in the immediate termination of my rights.” She contends the Subject Judge “granted extraordinary emergency relief to the Plaintiffs ... despite clear evidence that their filings contain contradictory and potentially fraudulent claims regarding the identity of the Defendants.”

Complainant takes issue with the Subject Judge's order denying her request for injunctive relief as focused on a "minor technicality," and she alleges the Subject Judge "used procedural 'shut-downs' to prevent" her cases from being consolidated. She contends the Subject Judge's decisions to terminate her from one case days before a critical hearing was "a strategic move that denies me the right to be heard." Finally, Complainant contends the Subject Judge violated the Code of Conduct for United States Judges by failing to be patient, dignified, courteous, and impartial.

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 Judge's official actions, findings, rulings, and orders in the above-described cases, the allegations are directly related to the merits of the Subject Judge's 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 Judge acted with an illicit or improper motive, was biased or otherwise not impartial, violated the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, 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