FILED U.S. COURT OF APPEALS ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

CONFIDENTIAL

MAY 06 2020

BEFORE THE CHIEF JUDGE OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

David J. Smith Clerk

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-19-90128 through 11-19-90130

IN THE MATTER OF A COMPLAINT FILED BY
IN RE: The Complaint of against United States Magistrate Judge and 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 Magistrate Judge and 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 March 2017 Complainant filed a prose civil rights complaint against Doctor, alleging in part that Dr had engaged in medical malpractice and was negligent in treating Complainant after Complainant was arrested. In May 2017 Complainant filed a complaint against multiple law enforcement officers, generally alleging that they had used excessive force when arresting him, which resulted in personal injury. That filing was docketed as an amended complaint, and Dr was terminated as a defendant. In December 2017 Judge issued an order dismissing the amended complaint as duplicative of another lawsuit Complainant had already filed. The order determined that the parties in that lawsuit did not significantly differ and the requested relief was the same.
In that case Complainant generally alleged that multiple law enforcement officers had used excessive force in restraining him, which resulted in personal injury. After he filed an amended complaint in that case, Complainant moved for leave to proceed in forma pauperis (IFP). In July 2017 he filed a third amended complaint against multiple law enforcement officers and a city. The same month, Judge entered an order granting Complainant's IFP motion, and the case proceeded

Later in July 2017, Judge issued an order dismissing the city and a
sheriff as defendants and dismissing Complainant's equal protection claims for failure to
state a claim on which relief could be granted. Complainant filed a fourth amended
complaint and an objection to the order dismissing defendants and claims. In August
2017 Judge entered an order construing the objection as a motion for
reconsideration and denying it as meritless. The order also struck the fourth amended
complaint because it was filed without leave of court or permission from the defendants.
After that, Complainant filed, among other things, motions for appointment of counsel,
which were denied without prejudice by Judges or
After additional proceedings, in March 2018 the remaining defendants filed a motion for summary judgment. Complainant filed, among other things, a response in opposition. In April 2019 Judge issued an opinion and order granting in part and denying in part the defendants' motion for summary judgment. The order denied the motion to the extent the defendants had argued that the claims were barred by Heck v. Humphery, 512 U.S. 477 (1994), but granted the motion based on a finding that the defendants were entitled to qualified immunity. A judgment was entered in the defendants' favor. After that, Complainant filed additional documents in the district court, including a notice of appeal. In October 2019 this Court dismissed the appeal as frivolous.
Complaint
In his Complaint of Judicial Misconduct or Disability, Complainant takes issue
with Judge order dismissing his initial case as duplicative and complains that
the court failed to address his medical malpractice claims against He asserts
that the clerk or a judge altered his complaint form by inserting two defendants while
refusing to insert, and he complains that was not added as a
defendant in his second case. Complainant alleges that the court's actions constitute
misconduct and show a mental or physical disability. He also alleges that the Subject
Judges took advantage of him because he is a poor pro se litigant. He complains that the
court denied his requests for the appointment of counsel and states that he "strongly
believes" there is a conflict of interest, bias, or prejudice in the court. He attached a
believes there is a contrict of interest, bias, or projudice in the court. The attached a

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.

To the extent Complainant's allegations concern the substance of the Subject Judges' official actions, rulings, findings, and orders in the cases, the 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 altered any filings, suffered from a disability, took advantage of him, had a conflict of interest, were biased or prejudiced, 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