CONFIDENTIAL

BEFORE THE CHIEF JUDGE OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT FILED
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

NOV 1 3 2015

Arny C. Nerenberg Acting Clerk of Court

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-15-90096 and 11-15-90097

IN THE MATTER OF A COMPLAINT FILED BY
IN RE: The Complaint of against U.S. District Judges and
of the U.S. District Court for the District of
under the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980, Chapter 16 of Title 28 U.S.C. §§ 351-364.
ORDER
("Complainant") has filed this Complaint against United States District Judges and (collectively, "the Subject Judges"), pursuant to Chapter 16 of Title 28 U.S.C. § 351(a) and the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States ("JCDR").
As an initial matter, after Complainant filed his Complaint, he filed two supplemental statements. The filing of those supplemental statements is approved. See 11th Cir. JCDR 6.7.
Background
The record shows that in December 2000 Complainant filed an employment
discrimination action against () and In May 2002 Judge
discrimination action against () and In May 2002 Judge granted summary judgment in favor of, but denied summary
judgment on the claims against After a trial in November 2003, the jury
returned a verdict in favor of Complainant on his retaliation claim against . A
judgment was entered stating that Complainant would recover from
\$ with interest, but the judgment did not provide the interest rate.
After that, filed a motion for judgment as a matter of law, or in the
alternative for a new trial or to alter or amend the judgment. Following a hearing, in
March 2004 Judge granted motion for judgment as a matter of law,
finding that the evidence at trial was insufficient for a reasonable jury to find for
Complainant on his retaliation claim. Judge also directed the clerk to vacate
the judgment in favor of Complainant and enter a judgment in favor of A new
judgment then was entered in favor of, and the case was closed. Complainant

appealed, and this Court affirmed the district court's grant of judgment as a matter of law in favor of
In August 2007 Complainant filed a motion for relief from judgment, arguing that and the clerk's office committed fraud by backdating documents to indicate that motion for judgment as a matter of law was timely filed. Judge denied the motion, finding the record clearly and conclusively established that no fraud was perpetrated. Complainant then filed a motion to recuse Judge, arguing that he had shown bias against Complainant and in favor of, and Judge denied the motion, finding no basis in law or fact for recusal. After that, Complainant filed additional motions seeking relief from the judgment, which Judge denied. Complainant appealed those decisions, and this Court affirmed the denial of his motions. Complainant also filed another motion to recuse Judge, which Judge denied. On October 1, 2013, the case was reassigned to a different district judge, and Judge was no longer assigned to the case.
On June 19, 2014, Complainant filed a "Motion for Court to Finalize Judgment for Enforcement of Stipulated Fact Agreement" in which he argued, among other things, that a final judgment was never entered in the case because pre-judgment interest was not added after trial. A few days later, the case was reassigned to Judge as the presiding district judge. On June 26, 2014, Judge denied Complainant's motion, stating that the case was closed, the judgment was final, and this Court had affirmed each ruling. Complainant filed a notice of appeal and moved to proceed in forma pauperis (IFP) on appeal. Judge denied the IFP motion, finding that Complainant's appeal was not taken in good faith and was frivolous within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). This Court later clerically dismissed the appeal for want of prosecution.
In May 2015 Complainant filed a "Motion to Recuse and Disqualify" Judge, generally arguing that he was biased and prejudiced "against Pro Se litigants, against [Complainant] proceeding pro se, or both." Complainant also filed another motion in which he argued that the judgment never became final. In September 2015 Judge issued an order denying the Motion to Recuse and Disqualify, generally finding that Complainant did not establish a basis for recusal, and denying the remaining motion, stating that "further efforts to undermine the Court's entry of judgment in favor of defendant are futile." Complainant filed a motion for reconsideration, which Judge denied.
Complaint
In his Complaint of Judicial Misconduct or Disability, Complainant alleges that Judge engaged in misconduct "by not causing the judgment to become final," and he challenges the finding that his non-finality argument was "frivolous."

Complainant argues that the case never became final after the jury trial because the judgment does not show the correct amount awarded, the prejudgment interest rate, or the date from which prejudgment interest was to accrue. He also argues that the "district court has disregarded the Stipulated Agreement between the parties" He contends that the case presents extraordinary circumstances justifying recall of the mandate.

Supplements

In his first supplemental statement, Complainant contends	s that Judge
engaged in misconduct "by not recusing and disqualifying himse	elf" from the case,
asserting that he was required to recuse and disqualify himself d	ue to the appearance of
bias and partiality against Complainant. He states, "Judge	knowing that he has
been called as a witness in my proceedings in this Court appears	to influence any
successor judge to follow his lead and that it does not matter who	o is judge the judgment
will never become final." Complainant attached Judge	September 2015 order
to his first supplemental statement.	

In his second supplemental statement, Complainant asserts that Judge continued to engage in misconduct by not recusing and disqualifying himself from the case and has continued to show bias and partiality against Complainant.

Discussion

Rule 3(h)(3)(A) of the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States provides that cognizable misconduct does not include "an allegation that is directly related to the merits of a decision or procedural ruling." The Rule provides that "[a]n allegation that calls into question the correctness of a judge's ruling, including a failure to recuse, without more, is merits-related." <u>Id.</u> The "Commentary on Rule 3" states in part:

Rule 3(h)(3)(A) 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 power by ensuring that the complaint procedure is not used to collaterally attack the substance of a judge's ruling. Any allegation that calls into question the correctness of an official action of a judge—without more—is merits-related.

To the extent Complainant's allegations concern the substance of the Subject Judges' findings and orders entered in the case, the allegations are directly related to the merits of the Subject Judges' decisions or procedural rulings. Apart from the decisions or procedural ruling that Complainant challenges, he provides no credible facts or evidence

in support of his allegations that Judge	was	biased	or partial	or that	t either of
the Subject Judges engaged in misconduct.					

The allegations of this Complaint are "directly related to the merits of a decision or procedural ruling," JCDR 11(c)(1)(B), and the Complaint "is based on allegations lacking sufficient evidence to raise an inference that misconduct has occurred or that a disability exists," JCDR 11(c)(1)(D). For those reasons, pursuant to Chapter 16 of Title 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii) and (iii), and Rule 11(c)(1)(B) and (D) of the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States, this Complaint is **DISMISSED**.

Chief Judge