## FILED U.S. COURT OF APPEALS ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

## **CONFIDENTIAL**

MAY 02 2017

## BEFORE THE ACTING CHIEF JUDGE OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

David J. Smith Clerk

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-16-90079 through 11-16-90093

IN THE MATTER OF A COMPLAINT FILED BY
IN RE: The Complaint of against U.S. Bankruptcy Judges and
of the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the District of; U.S.
District Judge of the U.S. District Court for the District of
; and U.S. Circuit Judges,,,
, , , , , , , , , , , , and
of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit, under the Judicial Conduct
and Disability Act of 1980, Chapter 16 of Title 28 U.S.C. §§ 351-364.
ORDER
(40 1: 40 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1
("Complainant") has filed this Complaint against United States
Bankruptcy Judges and, United States District Judge, and
United States Circuit Judges,,,,
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"). Judge retired as a bankruptcy judge in
Background
The record shows that in March 2002 in the United States District Court for the District of, a group of plaintiffs filed a lawsuit against Complainant, (""), and others ("the Case"). The district judge later held Complainant and in contempt for failing to comply with court orders. In December 2003 the district judge entered a judgment in favor of the plaintiffs and against, Complainant, and another defendant in an amount over \$2 million. In June 2004 the district judge entered a judgment providing that the court would issue a warrant for Complainant's arrest for contempt. A few years later, in December 2007 the district judge entered an "order of dismissal without prejudice" pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(a)(2) upon the request of a plaintiff.
In March 2003, through Complainant, filed a voluntary petition for Chapter 11 bankruptcy in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of, and Judge was the bankruptcy judge assigned to the case ("the 2003 Bankruptcy Case"). In April 2003 the U.S. Trustee and others filed motions to dismiss

the case with prejudice or, in the alternative, to convert it to a Chapter 7 case. In May 2003 the case was dismissed with prejudice.

In November 2005 the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") filed suit
against Complainant and others in the United States District Court for the
District of Complainant and other defendants filed a motion to quash a
subpoena issued by the SEC. Later that month, Judge entered an order denying
the motion, finding the defendants did not have standing to object to the subpoena and
holding that they were barred from collaterally attacking the order at issue. On appeal, a
panel of this Court comprised of Judges, and affirmed the
order denying the motion to quash. Complainant later filed various documents in the
case as well as two notices of appeal. In December 2015, a panel of this Court made up
of Judges and dismissed one appeal for lack of jurisdiction.
Complainant filed a motion for reconsideration, which the panel denied. In the second
appeal, a panel comprised of Judges, and dismissed the
appeal for lack of jurisdiction.
The record shows that in April 2007 a jury in the U.S. District Court for the
District of convicted on 1 count each of securities fraud and
conspiracy to commit securities fraud and wire fraud. In October 2007 Complainant was
sentenced to a term of 97 months of imprisonment. In November 2007 in the U.S.
District Court for the District of, a jury convicted on 3 counts
of contempt of court. In 2009 he was sentenced to a total term of 97 months of
imprisonment, 60 months of which were to be served consecutive to his other sentence.
,
In February 2013, Complainant filed an "Emergency Petition Pursuant to 28 USC
§ 2241," in the United States District Court for the District of He
named various defendants and challenged the conditions of his confinement. A
magistrate judge later entered an order directing the clerk to style the case as a civil rights
action and directing Complainant to pay the full filing fee or move to proceed in forma
pauperis. In June 2013 the magistrate judge issued a report recommending that the action
be dismissed for Complainant's failure to comply with the court's order. Over
Complainant's objections, Judge adopted the report and recommendation,
dismissed the action without prejudice, and denied Complainant's motions for abuse of
the court. Judge ordered Complainant to post a \$10,000 bond to satisfy an
award of sanctions for future frivolous filings, and stated that, until Complainant did so,
all papers submitted by Complainant in any action were to be filed in the case file.
Complainant then filed a number of documents. He also filed several appeals, which this
Court dismissed for lack of jurisdiction for want of prosecution.
COURT (DSM)SSECTION IACK OF DIFFISALCHON FOR WANT OF PROSECUTION

The record in this Court shows that in June 2015 Complainant filed a petition for writ of mandamus in which he argued that the bankruptcy court failed to docket a certain motion that he submitted in connection with the 2003 Bankruptcy Case. He then filed a motion to disqualify various judges. In September 2015 a two-judge panel comprised of

Judges and denied the motion to disqualify and directed the
bankruptcy court to respond to the mandamus petition. After Judge filed a
response, in March 2016 a panel of this Court comprised of Judges,,
and denied Complainant's mandamus petition, generally holding that
Complainant did not establish that he was entitled to relief. Complainant filed a motion
for reconsideration, which the panel denied in September 2016.
In October 2015 Complainant filed another petition for writ of mandamus here seeking, among other things, to have the district court file and docket a certain motion
and assign his case to a different district judge. In August 2016 a two-judge panel
comprised of Judges and denied the petition, determining that
Complainant had adequate alternative remedies to the relief sought.
Earlier Complaints
•
In October 2012 Complainant filed a Complaint of Judicial Misconduct against
Judge, alleging he was part of a conspiracy and engaged in criminal misconduct
that resulted in Complainant's incarceration. Then Chief Judge dismissed that
complaint because Judge had only been acting on the merits of the pleadings
before him, and because the allegations were not supported by evidence. Complainant
filed a petition for review, and the Judicial Council Review Panel affirmed the dismissal
in May 2013.
·
In May 2014 Complainant filed a Complaint of Judicial Misconduct or Disability
against Judge, Judge, and Judge, raising various allegations
pertaining to their actions in his cases. Chief Judge dismissed that complaint
because the judges had only been acting on the merits of the pleadings before them, and
because it did not allege sufficient evidence as to Judges and
Complainant filed a petition for review, and the Judicial Council Review Panel affirmed
the dismissal in October 2014.
In August 2015 Complainant filed a Complaint of Judicial Misconduct or
Disability against judges, including Judges , , , ,
, and , generally alleging that the judges were part
Disability against judges, including Judges,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
dismissed that complaint because the complained of judges were merely ruling
on the merits of the cases before them and because the allegations lacked sufficient
evidence to the extent it concerned Judges,,,,,,, and Complainant did not file a petition for review, and that
complaint matter is closed.

## Present Complaint

In the present Complaint of Judicial Misconduct or Disability, Complainant first
asserts that on December 20, 2007, in the Case, a "Final Judgment" was entered
on the merits in his and favor. He then alleges that since that time, the Judges
against whom he files this Complaint "knowingly, willfully, deliberately, and maliciously
violated the preclusive effects of the Final Judgment as part of an illegal plan and so orchestrated primarily by" Judges,,,,,
and others in the 2003 Bankruptcy Case. Complainant alleges that the Subject
Judges "organized a criminal enterprise, and used their official positions to viciously and
maliciously violate the Final Judgment's preclusive effects" to cover up bankruptcy fraud
and obstruct other proceedings. He also alleges that the Judges concealed evidence of
fraud and covered up Judges,, and bribery.
Next, Complainant alleges that Judges,,,,
, and others conspired to deny him access to the courts and to obstruct certain
"judicial pleadings" he filed. He alleges that Judges,, and
conspired with this Court's clerk to "hide, destroy, suppress, and conceal"
petitions that he submitted to this Court, and he asserts that many of the Subject Judges
conspired to obstruct justice and violate court orders. Complainant then asserts that
Judge has a "severe medical condition of Alzheimer[']s disease, and other
mental illnesses (schizophrenia and dementia)" and is "medically disqualified to serve as
a federal judge." He also seems to allege that Judge accepted bribes in
connection with his response to Complainant's mandamus petition.
<u>Discussion</u>
<u>Judge</u>
Rule 11(e) of the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings
of the Judicial Conference of the United States provides, "The chief judge may conclude
a complaint proceeding in whole or in part upon determining that intervening events
render some or all of the allegations moot or make remedial action impossible." With
respect to this rule, the "Commentary on Rule 11" states in part, "Rule 11(e) implements
Section 352(b)(2) of the Act, which permits the chief judge to 'conclude the proceeding'
if 'action on the complaint is no longer necessary because of intervening events,' such as
a resignation from judicial office." Judge has now retired from the federal
bench.
As to Judge, and in light of her retirement, "intervening events render
some or all of the allegations moot or make remedial action impossible," JCDR 11(e).
Pursuant to Chapter 16 of Title 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(2) and Rule 11(e) of the Rules for

Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States, this Complaint proceeding is <b>CONCLUDED</b> as to Judge
The Remaining Subject Judges
Rule 3(h)(3)(A) 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." Id. 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 Judges,
With respect to Judges,,,,,,,,,, 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). 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 as to Judges,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
Rectify Marchin Acting Chief Judge