CONFIDENTIAL

BEFORE THE CHIEF JUDGE

OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

FILED
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

MAY 1 3 2020

David J. Smith Clerk

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-19-90146 and 11-19-90147

IN THE MATTER OF A COMPLAINT FILED BY		
IN RE: The Complaint of against United States Magistrate Judge 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 Judge (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 January 2008 a federal grand jury issued a superseding indictment charging with multiple crimes. Following a trial, a jury found guilty on certain charges and not guilty on others. In June 2008 Judge sentenced to a total term of 130 months of imprisonment.		
After additional proceedings, in September 2019 Complainant filed in the case a "Citizens Jurisdictional Challenge" in which he asserted that the federal government did not have "territorial jurisdiction" inside the states unless one or both clauses in the Tenth Amendment to the United States Constitution are met. He also: (1) argued that convictions were invalid because of constitutional violations; (2) asserted that Judge had committed "Treasonous Acts"; and (3) sought the dismissal of the case for lack of territorial jurisdiction. In October 2019 Judge issued an order denying the Citizens Jurisdictional Challenge for lack of jurisdiction, determining that Complainant lacked standing to seek relief in the case.		
Complaint		
In his Complaint of Judicial Misconduct or Disability, Complainant alleges the Subject Judges violated their oaths of office, 18 U.S.C. § 241 (conspiracy against rights),		

18 U.S.C. § 242 (deprivation of right challenge the jurisdiction of all cour Citizens Jurisdictional Challenge that	rts. Complainant atta	ched the September 2019	
Complainant also attached a	September 2019 lette	r addressed to Judge	
	recusal from the case based on a conflict of		
interest, alleging that Judge			
case was assigned to Judge	and that he had p	rior knowledge of the case; and	
(2) stated that Judge "words are strongly indicative that he is racially			
	to another man who had been convicted of		
various offenses. Finally, Complair			
Citizens Jurisdictional Challenge.	<u> </u>		
Discussion			
Dula 4/h)/1) of the Dulas for	Judicial Conduct on	d Indicial Disability Proceedings	

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 _____ case, the allegations are directly related to the merits of the Subject Judges' decisions or procedural rulings. Apart from the decisions or procedural rulings with which Complainant takes issue, he provides no credible facts or evidence in support of his claims that the Subject Judges violated their oaths of office, committed crimes, had a conflict of interest, were racially biased, 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