

JUNE 04 2026

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-26-90099 through 11-26-90102

ORDER

An individual has filed a Complaint against three United States circuit judges and one 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 appealed the dismissal of a civil complaint he filed against two defendants, and a panel of this Court composed of the Subject Judges affirmed.

The record also establishes that Complainant filed a third amended civil complaint against multiple defendants and a notice stating he had been denied relief despite presenting evidence of corruption and misconduct. The Subject District Judge is assigned to the case, which remains pending.

Complaint

Complainant alleges the Subject Judges failed to act “on sworn evidence of criminal activity and mortal threats” and “allowed a ‘delusional’ narrative to persist while ignoring clear evidence of systemic corruption.” He states that he made the Subject Circuit Judges aware that a certain county was “an organized crime entity” but they failed to provide “protection or referrals,” which led to an incident where he was nearly killed. He contends the Subject District Judge “failed to act on a ‘Murder Exhibit’ and documented human rights violations, characterizing the situation as a routine discovery matter rather than a matter of extreme public interest and safety.” 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, orders, and opinion in Complainant's case and appeal, 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