

JUN 30 2026

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-26-90120 through and 11-26-90122

ORDER

An individual has filed a Complaint against three United States circuit judges 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 mandamus and multiple motions, including a motion to proceed as a disabled veteran. No action was taken on many of his motions because he used the incorrect filing event for the electronic filing system. A panel of the Subject Judges denied his mandamus petition, denied his motion to proceed as a disabled veteran, and denied additional motions as moot. Complainant filed a petition for rehearing en banc, which the panel construed as a petition for panel rehearing and denied. The panel also denied his requests

for reasonable accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act and Rehabilitation Act. Complainant then filed additional requests for relief, which the panel denied.

Complaint

Complainant alleges the Subject Judges failed to provide him accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act, failed to provide him meaningful access to the court, failed to perform judicial duties, and violated Supreme Court precedent and his due process rights. He contends the docket “shows a systemic pattern rejecting filings, refusing to correct procedural barriers, refusing to provide ADA accommodations, denying disability-related motions as ‘moot,’ and refusing to acknowledge disability.” He complains that no action was taken on filings for using the wrong filing event despite that he suffered from cognitive impairments and received no accommodations or assistance, which obstructed his access to the court and violated the Judicial Conference Disability Access Policy. He also takes issue with the denial of his motions as moot, contending that “ADA rights cannot be mooted by judicial refusal to act.” 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, and orders in the above-described case, the allegations are directly related to the merits of the Subject Judges’ decisions or procedural rulings. Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(B). Complainant otherwise provides no facts or 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