FILED ELEVENTH CIRCUIT JUDICIAL COUNCIL

APR 0 9 2020

CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

FOR THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

11-20-90003

IN RE:	COMPL	AINT O	F JUDICIAI	٠
MISCO	NDUCT	OR DIS	ABILITY	

ON PETITION FOR REVIEW

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

Upon consideration of the petitioner's complaint by a review panel consisting of Judges Wilson, William Pryor, Martin, Land, and Walker, the order of Chief Judge Ed Carnes, filed on 24 January 2020, and of the petition for review filed by the complainant on 24 February 2020, 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 INDICIAL COUNCIL

Litted States Circuit Judge

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

FILED
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

JAN 24 2020

CONFIDENTIAL

BEFORE THE CHIEF JUDGE OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

David J. Smith Clerk

Judicial Complaint No. 11-20-90003

IN THE MATTER OF A COMPLAINT FILED BY
IN RE: The Complaint of against United States Bankruptcy Judge of the United States Bankruptcy 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
Bankruptcy Judge ("Complainant") has filed this Complaint against United States Bankruptcy 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 her Complaint, she filed a supplemental statement. The filing of the supplemental statement is permitted. See 11th Cir. JCDR 6.7.
Background
The record shows that in January 2015 filed an amended complaint against Complainant, raising claims of defamation, intentional infliction of emotional distress, and interference with advantageous business relationships. After various proceedings, in December 2015 the district court entered a final judgment in favor of and against Complainant in the amount of \$1.7 million.
The record also shows that in May 2019 filed an involuntary petition for Chapter 11 bankruptcy against Complainant then filed an emergency motion for an automatic stay, and the Subject Judge denied the motion as moot. Later in May 2019,, as a judgment creditor and through his counsel of the law firm, filed an emergency motion to appoint a Chapter 11 Trustee or Examiner, contending that Complainant had a "longstanding and documented history of dishonesty and fraud" and the bankruptcy petition was part of an attempt to evade collection on his judgment.

On May 29, 2019, Complainant filed an adversary proceeding against, generally alleging that he had committed fraud to obtain an illegal judgment against her. The Subject Judge later dismissed the adversary proceeding due to Complainant's failure to pay the filing fee. Also on May 29, 2019, Complainant filed an emergency motion to remove as attorney, arguing that had a "favored relationship" with the court in part because she was the Subject Judge's former law clerk. The next day, following a hearing, the Subject Judge entered an "Order for Relief," granting relief under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code, noting that Complainant had consented to entry of an order for relief at the hearing and directing her to file various documents. The Subject Judge also entered an order denying the motion to remove
In June 2019 Complainant filed emergency motions: (1) to dismiss as a "fraudulent creditor"; (2) for a protective order to delay the initial debtor interview before the United States Trustee; (3) to remove the United States Trustee; and (4) for sanctions against, and The Subject Judge entered orders denying those motions the next day. After additional filings, the United States Trustee filed an emergency motion to convert or dismiss the case, arguing that Complainant had not provided required documents and had apparently transferred certain properties to after the filing of the involuntary petition but before entry of the Order for Relief.
On June 12, 2019, Complainant filed a motion to disqualify the Subject Judge, generally alleging that the case was "replete with bias, prejudice, partiality and illegal acts." Among other things, Complainant asserted that the Subject Judge: (1) failed to investigate allegations of fraud against; (2) deprived Complainant of her due process rights at an initial hearing; (3) had not permitted Complainant to present evidence; and (4) exhibited bias by not removing On June 17, 2019, the Subject Judge denied the motion, stating that: (1) the court was not an investigative body (2) Complainant's due process claim was baseless; (3) Complainant would be given the opportunity to present evidence at the appropriate time; and (4) the involvement of, who had been employed as a law clerk more than 10 years before the filing of the case, did not establish that the Subject Judge was biased.
Later in June 2019, the Subject Judge entered an order granting the United States Trustee's motion to convert, and the case was converted to a Chapter 7 case. Several days later, the United States Trustee filed a notice that it had appointed as trustee of Complainant's estate. Trustee filed an ex parte application to employ an attorney and the law firm, as counsel in the case, and the Subject Judge later granted the motion.
In late June 2019 Complainant filed another motion to disqualify the Subject Judge, alleging in part that she was using the bankruptcy court as a collection agency, as

a racketeering enterprise, and as a means to commit robbery, and that she had a patter and history of issuing "irrational and unlawful" rulings. The next month, the Subject Judge denied the motion, generally finding that Complainant had not established a bar for disqualification and had failed to objectively show that the court exhibited any negative bias or prejudice against her. Trustee filed a motion to compel Complainant's compliance with court orders and her attendance at the first meeting or creditors.		
In late July 2019 filed a motion to disqualify the Subject Judge, alleging that she had a pattern and history of bias and prejudice against him. The next month, the Subject Judge denied the motion, generally finding that had not established a basis for disqualification. Several days later, Complainant filed another motion to disqualify the Subject Judge, arguing in part that she had failed to file require financial disclosure statements and had used the court to run an "extortion racket" for years.	d	
On August 6, 2019, the Subject Judge granted Trustee motion to compel, directing Complainant to provide certain documents and to attend the meeting of creditors scheduled for the next day. On August 7, 2019, Complainant filed a response the order granting the motion to compel stating that she did not recognize the court's jurisdiction and raising various allegations of misconduct on the part of the Subject Judgand others. The same day, the Subject Judge entered an order denying the latest motion for disqualification, incorporating by reference her earlier orders denying motions to disqualify and noting that, under Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9011, Complainant did not have the right to make false statements in her filings.	to ge	
In mid-August 2019 filed a "Motion for Financial Disclosure" requesting that the Subject Judge provide him with her financial disclosure statements required by the Ethics in Government Act of 1978. The Subject Judge entered an order denying the motion without prejudice to seeking copies of the statements pursuant to the statute and its procedural mechanism.		
In September 2019 Trustee filed a "Motion to Approve Compromise of Controversy," seeking the court's approval of an agreement between Trustee and concerning proof of claim. Trustee and also initiated adversary proceedings against Complainant, objecting to entry of a discharge in the case. The clerk has entered defaults against Complainant in both adversary proceedings.		
On September 13, 2019, Trustee notified the court that he was satisficated that Complainant had provided the information required by 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(1). A feedays later, the Subject Judge entered an "Order Determining Debtor's Compliance with Filing Requirements of §521(a)(1)" and stating the case was not subject to automatic	W	

dismissal under the statute. In late October and early November 2019 Complainant filed another motion to disqualify the Subject Judge, a motion for a jury trial on that motion, and multiple emergency motions and supplements. The Subject Judge entered orders denying Complainant's motions. The Subject Judge also entered an order vacating the Order Determining Debtor's Compliance with Filing Requirements of §521(a)(1), noting the trustee had withdrawn his statement regarding the debtor's compliance as it was submitted in error. After that, Complainant filed multiple motions seeking various types of relief, including additional motions to disqualify, and the Subject Judge later denied the motions to disqualify.

In January 2020, following an evidentiary hearing, the Subject Judge issued an
opinion granting Trustee Motion to Approve Compromise of Controversy.
The order stated that the agreement, among other things, provided that claim
would be allowed but treated as a general unsecured claim and the parties would
exchange a mutual general release that would end the civil litigation between
Complainant and A couple of days later, the Subject Judge entered an order
directing Complainant to show cause why she should not be required to hire counsel or
seek leave of the court before filing anything with the court. The order stated that
Complainant had filed incomprehensible and repetitious motions, pleadings, and
complaints that contained profanity, conspiracy theories, and unfounded and false
statements about parties involved in the case and the court, and that she had disregarded
the court's warning not to submit documents that violated Rule 9011.
-

Complaint

In her Complaint of Judicial Misconduct or Disability, Complainant alleges that the Subject Judge has used the court "to perpetrate racketeering, embezzlement, collusion and conspiracy," and "through her unlawful extrajudicial associations has hand-picked a group of minions to engage in an extortion racket." Complainant states that the Subject Judge has "destroyed [her] life and the lives of countless [] others," and she asserts that she has met with other members of the public "who have and are being terrorized, threatened, retaliated and extorted" by the Subject Judge. She states that it is "well known in the legal and judicial community that [the Subject Judge] uses an incestuous group of her cohorts and cronies to extort the assets of those who appear in her court." Complainant asserts that each time she objects to the Subject Judge's "shocking and deliberate violation of law," the Subject Judge subjects her to "corrupt orders, harassment and retaliation." Complainant asserts that the Subject Judge's cases should be audited and she should be suspended from office.

Complainant alleges that the Subject Judge: (1) committed crimes and had a criminal conflict of interest; (2) violated judicial canons regarding restrictions on outside income and requirements for financial disclosure; (3) used her office for illegal financial gain; (4) "[o]bviously" accepted bribes, gifts, or other personal favors related to the

falsified facts; (7) held ex parte proceed egregious and hostile manner; (9) far district judge or chief circuit judge rejudicial misconduct; (10) violated judicial misconduct; (10) violated judicial in violation of 18 U.S.C. § (13) violated her oath of office. Con	to perpetrate an embezzlement scheme; (6) reedings; (8) treated Complainant in a demonstrably iled to call to the attention of the relevant chief eliable information reasonably likely to constitute edicial rules of procedure and evidence and acted (11) is incompetent; (12) "simulat[ed] a court 912 (Officer or employee of the United States); and implainant also alleges that the Subject Judge's ablic's trust and confidence in the credibility and
whom she "sources from her unlawf in her court, in violation of judicial of that the Subject Judge works with the enterprise" and "tailors her illegal von She states that: (1) the Subject Judge	Subject Judge has assembled a group of her "cronies' ful extrajudicial activities" and who regularly appear canons and laws on conflicts of interest. She asserts lose individuals to conduct an "embezzlement oid orders to perpetrate their embezzlement goal." e was past president of the Bar
ASSOCIATION, WHICH HAS OTHERS ITON	attorneys are attorneys are in the case; (2)
the Subject Judge is a member of the	e Association of the Bar,
which has members from	, and that attorneys are members of the
Subject Judge's "team": and (3)	is an attorney from, a former law
clerk of the Subject Judge, a membe	r of the "team," and attorney.
Complainant then takes issue	with the actions of other judges and
generally alleging that the judgment	obtained against her was the result of
criminal actions, and she contends the	nat the Subject Judge violated the Code of Conduct
for United States Judges by failing to	o report the misconduct of others. Complainant also
alleges that the Subject Judge illegal	ly precluded her from reporting criminal conduct and
ordered her to violate the law require	ing that she report such conduct.
Complainant alleges that the	
	together for years to "apparently extort the assets of
	y and criminally violate the law and criminally
violating the law limiting the amoun	at of compensation that can be paid to the trustee."
She states that the "media is replete	with stories of these obscene payments" and that it is
reported that the Subject Judge illegi	ally paid over \$10 million to in violation
	326. She cites an article stating that the Subject
	certain case, the total recovery was about law firm got to keep about million.
Complainant alleges that the Cubicat	t Judge illegally appointed Trustee on an
ev norte hasis. She contends that	is unfit to act as a trustee because he uses
ALM THE STATE OF THE PARTY AND	TO CHILL AND

information acquired in bankruptcy court in other cases and that his actions violate his duty to act independently.

Complainant alleges that the Subject Judge: (1) "routinely packs her court with an army of bailiffs to intimidate and threaten" Complainant; (2) "encourages backdoor deals and illegal ex part[e] communication between her crony attorneys to the exclusion of Complainant; (3) precludes the introduction of evidence at hearings, which results in orders based on perjury, hearsay, and fabricated statements; (4) altered her order stating Complainant had complied with bankruptcy filings to protect her team and perpetrate the embezzlement racket; (5) protected and rewarded for corruption and deception when he purposely did not provide Complainant with a copy of a lien; (6) is unlawfully using the bankruptcy court as a "collection agency" and a racketeering enterprise; and (7) is "threatening, coercing and putting [Complainant] in fear of robbery and extortion to unlawfully collect an illegal debt." She also alleges that the Subject Judge "uniformly fails to provide" Complainant with orders, instead providing them only to the opposing parties, which violates her due process rights and relegates her to "inferior and discriminated status." She asserts that the Subject Judge's team "run their mail through their own mailing meters," including a meter used by ______, and "set the incorrect date of mailing."

Complainant alleges that the Subject Judge has violated civil and criminal laws by deliberately refusing for 14 years to provide financial disclosure statements as required by the Ethics in Government Act of 1978. Complainant states that this alleged failure to disclose, together with the Subject Judge's payment of \$10 million to a trustee who is a standing member of her team, makes it apparent that the Subject Judge is using the court to accept and give bribes or other illegal financial or other benefits in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 201 (Bribery of public officials and witnesses). Complainant also asserts that the Subject Judge is committing "theft of services," is a public servant violating the public trust, and is covering up any potential conflicts of interests she may have, in violation of Complainant's due process rights and judicial canons.

Complainant alleges that the Subject Judge has issued "bizarre, illogical, deceptive, illegal 'rulings' that defy logic and criminally and civilly violate the law," and that "[a]ny reasonable person" would conclude she "exhibits a scary, dangerous lack of reason, logic and control of her faculties that appears to be in the nature of a mental disorder" She also alleges that the Subject Judge viciously and illegally attacked an attorney who made a comment about her "mental dysfunction." Complainant cites, among other things, an article stating that the Subject Judge had "decided to go easy" on an attorney after he made a certain remark about her.

Finally, Complainant asserts that she is in imminent danger and that her assets have been illegally seized and garnished. She "seeks whistleblower protection from acts of retaliation, coercion, discrimination, intimidation and threats she is experiencing by

[the Subject Judge] and any judge associated with, acting in collusion with or on behalf of' the Subject Judge. She attached various documents to her Complaint, including what she characterizes as a sample of the Subject Judge's "bizarre, irrational, illegal" orders.

Supplement

In her supplemental statement, Complainant generally reiterates many of her allegations, contends that two of her appeals are "being neglected," and states that "[i]t appears this commission is acting as an accomplice and accessory to the embezzlement of [her] assets."

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 the case, the allegations are directly related to the merits of the Subject Judge's decisions or procedural rulings. Complainant's remaining claims, including her bare and unsupported assertion that the Subject Judge failed to file required financial disclosure statements, are based on allegations lacking sufficient evidence to raise an inference that the Subject Judge: (1) committed crimes or had a conflict of interest; (2) violated judicial canons; (3) used her office for personal financial gain; (4) accepted gifts, bribes, or other personal favors related to the judicial office; (5) conspired with _______ or others; (6) falsified facts; (7) held improper ex parte proceedings; (8) treated Complainant or others in a demonstrably egregious and hostile manner; (9) improperly failed to report misconduct; (10) violated the Code of Conduct for United States Judges or other "judicial rules"; (11) is incompetent; (12) "simulated" a court official; or (13) violated her oath of office.

Nor has Complainant presented evidence to raise any inference that the Subject Judge: (1) took actions to intimidate and threaten Complainant; (2) engaged in improper ex parte communications; (3) conducted hearings or issued orders based on an illicit or improper motive; (4) engaged in an embezzlement racket; (5) protected or rewarded		
Judge: (1) took actions to intimidate and threaten Complainant; (2) engaged in improper ex parte communications; (3) conducted hearings or issued orders based on an illicit or improper motive; (4) engaged in an embezzlement racket; (5) protected or rewarded; (6) unlawfully used the bankruptcy court as a "collection agency" and racketeering enterprise; (7) threatened or coerced Complainant to collect an illegal debt; or (8) otherwise engaged in misconduct. With respect to Complainant's claim that the Subject Judge participated in "unlawful extrajudicial activities" because she was past president of the		
Judge: (1) took actions to intimidate and threaten Complainant; (2) engaged in improper ex parte communications; (3) conducted hearings or issued orders based on an illicit or improper motive; (4) engaged in an embezzlement racket; (5) protected or rewarded; (6) unlawfully used the bankruptcy court as a "collection agency" and racketeering enterprise; (7) threatened or coerced Complainant to collect an illegal debt; or (8) otherwise engaged in misconduct. With respect to Complainant's claim that the Subject Judge participated in "unlawful extrajudicial activities" because she was past president of the		
Judge: (1) took actions to intimidate and threaten Complainant; (2) engaged in improper ex parte communications; (3) conducted hearings or issued orders based on an illicit or improper motive; (4) engaged in an embezzlement racket; (5) protected or rewarded; (6) unlawfully used the bankruptcy court as a "collection agency" and racketeering enterprise; (7) threatened or coerced Complainant to collect an illegal debt; or (8) otherwise engaged in misconduct. With respect to Complainant's claim that the Subject Judge participated in "unlawful extrajudicial activities" because she was past president of the		•
Judge: (1) took actions to intimidate and threaten Complainant; (2) engaged in improper ex parte communications; (3) conducted hearings or issued orders based on an illicit or improper motive; (4) engaged in an embezzlement racket; (5) protected or rewarded; (6) unlawfully used the bankruptcy court as a "collection agency" and racketeering enterprise; (7) threatened or coerced Complainant to collect an illegal debt; or (8) otherwise engaged in misconduct. With respect to Complainant's claim that the Subject Judge participated in "unlawful extrajudicial activities" because she was past president of the		
Judge: (1) took actions to intimidate and threaten Complainant; (2) engaged in improper ex parte communications; (3) conducted hearings or issued orders based on an illicit or improper motive; (4) engaged in an embezzlement racket; (5) protected or rewarded; (6) unlawfully used the bankruptcy court as a "collection agency" and racketeering enterprise; (7) threatened or coerced Complainant to collect an illegal debt; or (8) otherwise engaged in misconduct. With respect to Complainant's claim that the Subject Judge participated in "unlawful extrajudicial activities" because she was past president of the	Nor has Complainant presented evidence to raise any	inference that the Subject
ex parte communications; (3) conducted hearings or issued orders based on an illicit or improper motive; (4) engaged in an embezzlement racket; (5) protected or rewarded; (6) unlawfully used the bankrupty court as a "collection agency" and racketeering enterprise; (7) threatened or coerced Complainant to collect an illegal debt; or (8) otherwise engaged in misconduct. With respect to Complainant's claim that the Subject Judge participated in "unlawful extrajudicial activities" because she was past president of the		
; (6) unlawfully used the bankruptcy court as a "collection agency" and racketeering enterprise; (7) threatened or coerced Complainant to collect an illegal debt; or (8) otherwise engaged in misconduct. With respect to Complainant's claim that the Subject Judge participated in "unlawful extrajudicial activities" because she was past president of the		
racketeering enterprise; (7) threatened or coerced Complainant to collect an illegal debt; or (8) otherwise engaged in misconduct. With respect to Complainant's claim that the Subject Judge participated in "unlawful extrajudicial activities" because she was past president of the		
with respect to Complainant's claim that the Subject Judge participated in "unlawful extrajudicial activities" because she was past president of the	; (6) unlawfully used the bankruptcy court as a "c	collection agency" and
With respect to Complainant's claim that the Subject Judge participated in "unlawful extrajudicial activities" because she was past president of the	racketeering enterprise; (7) threatened or coerced Complains	ant to collect an illegal debt;
"unlawful extrajudicial activities" because she was past president of the	or (8) otherwise engaged in misconduct.	
"unlawful extrajudicial activities" because she was past president of the	What was a second strength of the strength of the second strength of	To doe would in add in
Association and a member of the		
Complainant's claim does not raise an inference that the Subject Judge engaged in misconduct. See Guide to Judiciary Policy, Vol. 2B, Ch. 2, Advisory Opinion No. 34 "Service as Officer or on Governing Board of Bar Association" ("In conclusion, we are of the opinion that a judge may properly serve as an officer or member of a board, council or committee of a bar association, subject to the restrictions set forth in Canon 4."). Finally, with respect to Complainant's claim that Trustee was paid an amount that exceeded the limits set out in 11 U.S.C. § 326, she has not shown that an improper payment was made. The article that Complainant cites states that law firm received a payment following the settlement of a case. Under 11 U.S.C. §§ 327 and 328, a court may approve a trustee's employment of one or more attorneys and may authorize the trustee to act as attorney for the estate, "on any reasonable terms and conditions of employment." Complainant's allegations about the payment of law firm raise no inference of judicial 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		
misconduct. See Guide to Judiciary Policy, Vol. 2B, Ch. 2, Advisory Opinion No. 34 "Service as Officer or on Governing Board of Bar Association" ("In conclusion, we are of the opinion that a judge may properly serve as an officer or member of a board, council or committee of a bar association, subject to the restrictions set forth in Canon 4."). Finally, with respect to Complainant's claim that Trustee was paid an amount that exceeded the limits set out in 11 U.S.C. § 326, she has not shown that an improper payment was made. The article that Complainant cites states that law firm received a payment following the settlement of a case. Under 11 U.S.C. §§ 327 and 328, a court may approve a trustee's employment of one or more attorneys and may authorize the trustee to act as attorney for the estate, "on any reasonable terms and conditions of employment." Complainant's allegations about the payment of law firm raise no inference of judicial 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		
"Service as Officer or on Governing Board of Bar Association" ("In conclusion, we are of the opinion that a judge may properly serve as an officer or member of a board, council or committee of a bar association, subject to the restrictions set forth in Canon 4."). Finally, with respect to Complainant's claim that Trustee was paid an amount that exceeded the limits set out in 11 U.S.C. § 326, she has not shown that an improper payment was made. The article that Complainant cites states that law firm received a payment following the settlement of a case. Under 11 U.S.C. §§ 327 and 328, a court may approve a trustee's employment of one or more attorneys and may authorize the trustee to act as attorney for the estate, "on any reasonable terms and conditions of employment." Complainant's allegations about the payment of law firm raise no inference of judicial 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		
of the opinion that a judge may properly serve as an officer or member of a board, council or committee of a bar association, subject to the restrictions set forth in Canon 4."). Finally, with respect to Complainant's claim that Trustee was paid an amount that exceeded the limits set out in 11 U.S.C. § 326, she has not shown that an improper payment was made. The article that Complainant cites states that law firm received a payment following the settlement of a case. Under 11 U.S.C. §§ 327 and 328, a court may approve a trustee's employment of one or more attorneys and may authorize the trustee to act as attorney for the estate, "on any reasonable terms and conditions of employment." Complainant's allegations about the payment of law firm raise no inference of judicial 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		
Finally, with respect to Complainant's claim that Trustee was paid an amount that exceeded the limits set out in 11 U.S.C. § 326, she has not shown that an improper payment was made. The article that Complainant cites states that law firm received a payment following the settlement of a case. Under 11 U.S.C. §§ 327 and 328, a court may approve a trustee's employment of one or more attorneys and may authorize the trustee to act as attorney for the estate, "on any reasonable terms and conditions of employment." Complainant's allegations about the payment of law firm raise no inference of judicial 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		
Finally, with respect to Complainant's claim that Trustee was paid an amount that exceeded the limits set out in 11 U.S.C. § 326, she has not shown that an improper payment was made. The article that Complainant cites states that law firm received a payment following the settlement of a case. Under 11 U.S.C. §§ 327 and 328, a court may approve a trustee's employment of one or more attorneys and may authorize the trustee to act as attorney for the estate, "on any reasonable terms and conditions of employment." Complainant's allegations about the payment of law firm raise no inference of judicial misconduct. The allegations of this Complaint are "directly related to the merits of a decision or procedural ruling," JCDR 11(e)(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(e)(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(e)(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		
Finally, with respect to Complainant's claim that Trustee was paid an amount that exceeded the limits set out in 11 U.S.C. § 326, she has not shown that an improper payment was made. The article that Complainant cites states that law firm received a payment following the settlement of a case. Under 11 U.S.C. §§ 327 and 328, a court may approve a trustee's employment of one or more attorneys and may authorize the trustee to act as attorney for the estate, "on any reasonable terms and conditions of employment." Complainant's allegations about the payment of law firm raise no inference of judicial 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	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
amount that exceeded the limits set out in 11 U.S.C. § 326, she has not shown that an improper payment was made. The article that Complainant cites states that law firm received a payment following the settlement of a case. Under 11 U.S.C. §§ 327 and 328, a court may approve a trustee's employment of one or more attorneys and may authorize the trustee to act as attorney for the estate, "on any reasonable terms and conditions of employment." Complainant's allegations about the payment of law firm raise no inference of judicial 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		
improper payment was made. The article that Complainant cites states that law firm received a payment following the settlement of a case. Under 11 U.S.C. §§ 327 and 328, a court may approve a trustee's employment of one or more attorneys and may authorize the trustee to act as attorney for the estate, "on any reasonable terms and conditions of employment." Complainant's allegations about the payment of law firm raise no inference of judicial 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		
law firm received a payment following the settlement of a case. Under 11 U.S.C. §§ 327 and 328, a court may approve a trustee's employment of one or more attorneys and may authorize the trustee to act as attorney for the estate, "on any reasonable terms and conditions of employment." Complainant's allegations about the payment of law firm raise no inference of judicial 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	<u>₹</u>	
and 328, a court may approve a trustee's employment of one or more attorneys and may authorize the trustee to act as attorney for the estate, "on any reasonable terms and conditions of employment." Complainant's allegations about the payment of law firm raise no inference of judicial 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		
authorize the trustee to act as attorney for the estate, "on any reasonable terms and conditions of employment." Complainant's allegations about the payment of law firm raise no inference of judicial 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		
conditions of employment." Complainant's allegations about the payment of law firm raise no inference of judicial 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		
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		
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		at the payment of
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	Man 1000 no mileterio de judicial mileterio	
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	The allegations of this Complaint are "directly related	d to the merits of a decision
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	or procedural ruling," JCDR 11(c)(1)(B), and the Complaint	t "is based on allegations
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	lacking sufficient evidence to raise an inference that miscon	duct has occurred or that a
Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States, this Complaint is DISMISSED. Chief Judge	disability exists," JCDR 11(c)(1)(D). For those reasons, pur	suant to Chapter 16 of Title
United States, this Complaint is DISMISSED. School States, this Complaint is DISMISSED. Chief Judge	28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii) and (iii), and Rule 11(c)(1)(B)	and (D) of the Rules for
Schief Judge Chief Judge		Judicial Conference of the
	United States, this Complaint is DISMISSED.	7 1
	- bb	4
	266	me
	Chief Ju	dge
8		
8		
8		•
8		
8		·
	. 8	
·	•	