FOR THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

11-18-90148

FILED ELEVENTH CIRCUIT JUDICIAL COUNCIL

AUG 21 2019

CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

IN RE: COMPLAINT OF JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT OR DISABILITY

ON PETITION FOR REVIEW*

Before: TJOFLAT, MARCUS, WILSON, WILLIAM PRYOR, MARTIN, JORDÁN, ROSENBAUM, JILL PRYOR, and NEWSOM, Circuit Judges; MOORE, MERRYDAY, THRASH, BOWDRE, LAND, DuBOSE, HALL, WALKER, and MARKS, Chief District Judges.

Upon consideration of the petitioner's complaint by a review panel consisting of Judges Tjoflat, Wilson, William Pryor, Land, and Walker, the order of Chief Judge Ed Carnes, filed on 24 May 2019, and of the petition for review filed by the complainant on 19 June 2019, with no non-disqualified judge on the Judicial Council Review Panel having requested that this matter be placed on the agenda of a meeting of the Judicial Council,

The Judicial Council Review Panel hereby determines that the disposition of this matter was proper and said disposition is hereby AFFIRMED.

The foregoing actions are APPROVED.

FOR THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL:

United States Circuit Judge

Chief Circuit Judge Ed Carnes did not take part in the review of this petition.

.

CONFIDENTIAL

BEFORE THE CHIEF JUDGE

OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

FILED
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

MAY 24 2019

David J. Smith Clerk

Judicial Complaint No. 11-18-90148

IN THE MATTER OF A COMPLAINT FILED BY		
IN RE: The Complaint of against, U.S. District Judge for 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 Judge (the "Subject Judge"), 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 five supplemental statements. The filing of the supplemental statements is permitted. <u>See</u> 11th Cir. JCDR 6.7.		
Background		
The record shows that in August 2011 a federal grand jury indicted Complainant and a codefendant on various charges, including multiple counts related to sex trafficking. At an initial appearance where Assistant United States Attorney appeared on behalf of the government, a magistrate judge noted that the indictment would be unsealed and stated, "The charges are summarized as sexual exploitation of a minor and sex trafficking of children by force, fraud or coercion." stated, "Your Honor, as a correction, there is no allegation that there were any minors involved."		
After various proceedings, in October 2011 the grand jury issued a superseding indictment, charging Complainant with multiple counts related to sex trafficking and distribution of a controlled substance. Complainant pleaded not guilty to the charges and proceeded to trial, and acted as the prosecutor in the case. A jury found Complainant guilty on 18 counts charged in the superseding indictment. In February 2012 the Subject Judge sentenced Complainant to a total term of life imprisonment. Complainant appealed his convictions and sentences, and he later appealed a forfeiture order.		

In August 2012 Complainant filed a motion for disclosure of grand jury transcripts and materials, arguing that they were necessary to establish whether the grand jury was influenced by the suggestion that the acts committed involved minors. The next month, the Subject Judge denied the motion, generally finding that Complainant had not demonstrated a compelling and particularized need for disclosure of the grand jury transcripts. Complainant also appealed that order. In March 2013 Complainant filed two motions requesting information about the grand jury, which the Subject Judge denied, finding that he had failed to meet his burden to justify disclosure.

In May 2014, after consolidating Complainant's appeals, this Court affirmed Complainant's convictions and sentences and affirmed the denial of disclosure of grand jury transcripts and materials. This Court held, among other things, that: (1) Complainant had waived his challenges to the indictment; (2) the evidence was sufficient to sustain his convictions; and (3) his argument that the government had improperly withheld evidence was meritless. Addressing Complainant's argument that the indictments were procured by deception, this Court held that even if his allegations of misconduct were true, the jury verdict rendered any error harmless.

In January 2016 Complainant filed a counseled 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion to vacate, set aside, or correct his sentence, raising various challenges to his convictions. A few months later, he filed an amended § 2255 motion, arguing, among other things, that his counsel was ineffective for failing to challenge the indictment and superseding indictment on the ground that "each was obtained by the government misleading the grand juries that the alleged crimes . . . involved minors." The government, through Assistant United States Attorney ______, filed a response. In October 2016 Complainant filed a reply and requested an evidentiary hearing.

In June 2017 a magistrate judge entered an order and report denying Complainant's motion for an evidentiary hearing and recommending that his § 2255 motion be denied. The magistrate judge found in part that there was no merit to Complainant's claim that the government had misled the grand jury into believing that he had been involved in crimes against minors. In August 2017 Complainant filed objections to the report. He also filed a motion to terminate counsel and proceed pro se, which the Subject Judge granted.

In December 2017 the Subject Judge issued an order adopting the magistrate judge's report with certain exceptions, denying Complainant's § 2255 motion, denying him a certificate of appealability (COA), and denying as unnecessary his request for an evidentiary hearing. After that, Complainant filed an amended Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion to alter or amend the judgment, which the Subject Judge denied. Complainant appealed and filed a motion for COA in this Court. In January 2019 this Court denied Complainant's motion for a COA, holding that he had failed to make the requisite showing.

Complaint

In his Complaint of Judicial Misconduct or Disability, Complainant alleges that the Subject Judge has a personal bias against him and a "racial prejudice, judicial prejudice/bias, and [an] outright impartiality to black males who find themselves as defendants in his courtroom." Complainant asserts that the Subject Judge: (1) "go[es] out of his way in order to conceal the many crimes/judicial misconduct he himself has committed"; (2) "go[es] out of his way to protect others who commit crimes within his courtroom as long as it's against the black defendant"; and (3) "will even ignore and over rule Circuit Precedent . . . to ensure that the defendant unjustly loses his or her case." He later states that the Subject Judge's "unlawful sentence of 13 consecutive life terms should be more than enough to alert this Office of his prejudice" and bias toward Complainant.

Complainant asserts that, with the help of the Subject Judge: (1)				
"fabricated an entire federal case against" him; (2) "secretly concealed exculpatory				
evidence"; and (3) "lied to a federal grand jury concerning completely factious [sic]	ı			
minors/children" because he knew this would cause the grand jury to issue an indicate the grand jury to issue the				
Complainant states that "one of the reasons" the Subject Judge denied Complainant				
§ 2255 motion and Rule 59(e) motion was to prevent him from having an evidentian				
hearing "for fears of the expansion of the record that would prove everything I've b	-			
saying against him, and to be true." He argues that the Subject Judge di				
allow an evidentiary hearing "because evidence would come fo[]rth that he himself				
involved in criminal and judicial misconduct and disability." Complainant asserts t	nat			
the Subject Judge: (1) "acts as a gatekeeper of this evidence for" and	• .			
and (2) "aided and abetted into concealing these crimes aga	ınst			
me for years until now."				
Commission of states that the Cubicat Index the man have been consist and handed	haina			
Complainant states that the Subject Judge "has now been caught red handed				
a material witness for his close friend" He states that, in connection witness for his close friend"	un a			
Bar Complaint, submitted a sworn affidavit in which he listed the Subjection	CT			
Judge as a witness who would help him prove his version of events. Complainant				
contends that this requires the Subject Judge's disqualification from his case under 28				
U.S.C. § 455(b)(3). Complainant asserts that the Subject Judge: (1) "bailed				
out of being found guilty by the Bar"; (2) did a "favor" by b	eing a			
witness on his behalf; (3) violated the Code of Conduct for United States Judges by being				
a character witness and material witness in the Bar proceedings; and (4) lent the pre-	stige			
of his office to aid in having a bar complaint dismissed.				
Complainant alleges that an email sent to Complainant's attorned				
contained multiple lies, and he asserts that the Subject Judge knew lied				
lent the prestige of his office to aid and abet him in concealing the lies and to help l	шп			

commit perjury. Complainant attaches what he claims is "direct evidence" that the
Subject Judge was used as a material witness for "outside of a federal
proceeding," and that the Subject Judge and concealed "exculpatory reports
about the illegal use of minors/children that were used to federally indict" him.
Complainant attached various documents to his Complaint. In one attachment, he
alleges that: (1) the Subject Judge aided and abetted effort to conceal
information by sealing certain reports and other information, and he asserts that (2) the
indictment, superseding indictment, and a search warrant were fraudulent. He contends
that certain documents establish that the grand jury was told that minors or juveniles were
the victims in the case. Complainant alleges that: (1) the Subject Judge was "impaired by
his alliance with", which caused him to be "unable to function properly"; (2)
his conduct caused a substantial and widespread lowering of public confidence in the
courts; and (3) he used his office to obtain special treatment for his friends.
•
Complainant also attached a January 2015 letter from to the
Bar responding to a complaint that Complainant filed against him. In the letter,
generally argued there was no evidence in support of Complainant's
allegations that he lied to the grand jury about the involvement of minor children, sealed
certain documents to prevent Complainant to accessing them, or failed to disclose
exculpatory evidence. In conclusion, stated, "Indeed, if you have any
questions at all about my conduct during the course of this case, I would urge you to
contact," various individuals, including "the federal judge who heard the case, the
Honorable"stated:
all of whom, I have no doubt, will confirm that I prosecuted this case fairly
and to the best of my abilities, that I never lied or falsified any documents or
evidence, that I never withheld any evidence from the defense, let alone
exculpatory evidence, and that I at all times conducted myself in a manner
befitting an officer of the court and a proper public servant.
<u>Supplements</u>
In his first supplemental statement, Complainant generally reiterates his arguments
that the Subject Judge improperly acted as a material witness for, as
established by January 2015 response to the Bar. In his second
supplemental statement, Complainant reiterates certain allegations and also alleges that
the Subject Judge should have disqualified himself from the § 2255 proceedings "because
of his injection into the proceedings of the Bar Complaint," and Complainant contends that the outcome of either proceeding could affect the other.
contends that the outcome of either proceeding could affect the other.
In the third supplemental statement, Complainant reiterates various allegations and
contends the Subject Judge must be disqualified because he had personal knowledge of

disputed evidentiary facts concerning the	Bar proceedings, which was an	
	bject Judge: (1) learned about new evidence	
during the Bar proceedings that	would have helped Complainant prove that	
his indictment initially charged him with cri	imes against minors; and (2) used information	
from the Bar proceeding to unlawfully deny	Complainant an evidentiary hearing in the	
§ 2255 case. Complainant asserts that the S	Subject Judge and "are very close	
	in his efforts to become a federal	
district judge. He attached documents to hi	s third supplement. In his fourth supplement,	
Complainant contends that the Subject Judge was required to recuse himself from the		
case, and that he has a "very harsh destain/bias [sic] against" Complainant. In his fifth		
supplement, Complainant generally reiterates his arguments that the Subject Judge should		
be recused.		

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 Judge's official actions, findings, rulings, and orders in Complainant's cases, the allegations are directly related to the merits of the Subject Judge's decisions or procedural rulings. Complainant's remaining claims are based on allegations lacking sufficient evidence to raise an inference that the Subject Judge: (1) had a personal bias against him; (2) was racially biased or prejudiced; (3) was not impartial; (4) concealed crimes, misconduct, or evidence; (5) conspired with or aided _______ in committing crimes, fabricating documents, or withholding evidence; (6) improperly acted as a witness in ______ proceedings before the _______ Bar; (7) used his office to obtain special treatment for his friends; (8) violated the Code of Conduct for United States Judges; or (9) 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