CONFIDENTIAL

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

MAR 0 2 2020

David J. Smith Clerk

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-19-90107 and 11-19-90108

IN THE MATTER OF A COMPLAINT FILED BY
IN RE: The Complaint of against United States District Judges and of the United States 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").
Background
The record shows that in October 2017 Complainant filed a <u>pro se</u> employment discrimination lawsuit against his employer, a counselor named, and others. He also filed a motion to proceed <u>in forma pauperis</u> (IFP) and for the appointment of counsel, and Judge entered an order granting the IFP motion but denying without prejudice the motion for appointment of counsel. In early November 2017 return receipts were entered on the docket, indicating that process had been served on and other defendants.
In December 2017 Complainant filed a motion for leave to file an amended complaint and a motion for entry of a default judgment against Later that month, Judge entered an order directing Complainant to file an amended complaint and denying as moot his motion for entry of a default judgment. In January 2018 Complainant filed an amended complaint. Multiple defendants filed motions to dismiss, and in February 2018 Complainant filed a motion to appoint counsel. In October 2018 the case was reassigned to Judge as the presiding district judge.
The next month, Complainant filed a motion for the appointment of counsel and a motion for a default judgment against The clerk's office then issued an entry of default against due to her failure to appear in the case. Later in November 2018 filed a response in which she stated that, although she did sign for an envelope pertaining to the case in October 2017, she did not open the envelope because it was not addressed to her attached a picture of an envelope that was

final default judgment against with an affidavit in support.
In March 2019 Judge entered an order construing response as a motion to set aside the clerk's entry of default and granting the motion for good cause shown. The order also denied Complainant's motion for entry of final default judgment against and directed to file an answer or other responsive pleading. Judge then issued an opinion and order granting one defendant's motion to dismiss in its entirety, granting in part and denying in part other defendants' motions to dismiss, directing Complainant to file a second amended complaint, and denying his motions for the appointment of counsel.
In April 2019 Complainant filed a second amended complaint, and are other defendants filed motions to dismiss. In July 2019 Judge issued an opinion and order ruling on the motions to dismiss, dismissing certain claims with prejudice, and allowing certain claims to proceed. After that, one defendant and Complainant filed motions for reconsideration. In August 2019 Judge entered an order granting in part the defendant's motion to reconsider to the extent that the court's previous ruling was amended to find that a certain statute applied to a claim against the defendant. Judge also issued an order denying Complainant's motion to reconsider.
Complaint
In his Complaint of Judicial Misconduct or Disability, Complainant states that he is a member of protected classes and alleges the Subject Judges "exhibited Documented Disability, Racial, Gender Discrimination and Bias toward" him. He contends that Judg, without considering his disability, health, economic circumstances, or time, delayed taking action in the case for over nine months and then transferred the case to Judge without a ruling.
Complainant states that the United States Marshals committed "multiple errors" is serving He alleges that Judge: (1) favored and discriminated against him; (2) "accepted an unacceptable and flawed" response from; (3) improperly construed her response as a motion to stay entry of the default; (4) improperly and with bias revoked the entry of default; and (5) improperly denied the motion for a default judgment and gave time to respond. Complainant also alleges that Judge acted in concert with the clerk in failing to protect Complainant's rights and failing to address his motions, and "[e]ffectively [c]olluded" with and the district court in flouting the court's jurisdiction and the law. Finally, Complainant takes issue with the actions of individuals other than the Subject Judges.

Discussion

Rule 4(b)(1) of the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States, "Allegations Related to the Merits of a Decision or Procedural Ruling," 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" states in part:

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.

In addition, Rule 4(b)(2) provides that cognizable misconduct does not include "an allegation about delay in rendering a decision or ruling, unless the allegation concerns an improper motive in delaying a particular decision or habitual delay in a significant number of unrelated cases." The "Commentary on Rule 4" provides that "a complaint of delay in a single case is excluded as merits-related. Such an allegation may be said to challenge the correctness of an official action of the judge, <u>i.e.</u>, assigning a low priority to deciding the particular case."

To the extent Complainant's allegations, including his complaints about delay, concern the substance of the Subject Judges' official actions, rulings, findings, and orders in the case, those allegations are directly related to the merits of the Subject Judges' decisions or procedural rulings. Apart from the decisions or procedural rulings that Complainant challenges, he provides no credible facts or evidence in support of his claims that the Subject Judges acted with an illicit or improper motive, discriminated against him, were biased against him or in favor of ______, colluded with others, or otherwise 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