CONFIDENTIAL

BEFORE THE CHIEF JUDGE OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

FILED
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT
MAY 19 2020

Judicial Complaint No. 11-20-90004

David J. Smith Clerk

IN THE MATTER OF A COMPLAINT FILED BY
IN RE: The Complaint of against United States District 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 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 a supplemental statement. The filing of the supplemental statement is permitted. See 11th Cir. JCDR 6.7.
Background
The record shows that in August 2017 a federal grand jury issued an indictment charging multiple codefendants, including
In October 2018 filed a motion to dismiss his attorney, raising various complaints about her representation. Following a hearing, a magistrate judge dismissed the motion as moot, noting that and his counsel had reported that complaints had been resolved. In June 2019 filed another motion to dismiss his counsel, which a magistrate judge later denied, finding that had not shown good cause for replacing his attorney.
is referred to by his first name in order to distinguish him from Complainant, who has the

same last name.

In July 2019 pleaded guilty before the Subject Judge to a lesser
included offense in the indictment. In December 2019 filed two pro se
motions to withdraw his plea, generally arguing that his plea was induced by his
counsel's deficient performance. That same month, the Subject Judge issued an order
denying the motions, finding that had not shown fair and just cause for the
withdrawal of his plea.
In January 2020 attorney filed a motion to withdraw, contending that she and had irreconcilable differences, and the next month, the Subject Judge denied the motion on procedural grounds. In March 2020 the Subject Judge sentenced to a term of 71 months of imprisonment.
Complaint
In his Complaint of Judicial Misconduct or Disability, Complainant asserts thatinvoluntarily pleaded guilty due to the deficient performance of his appointed counsel and "pressure of court 'to work things out." Complainant states that attorney was informed that he wished to withdraw his plea but took no action. He notes that the Subject Judge denied motion to withdraw his plea and his request for
new counsel.
Complainant states that repeatedly informed the Subject Judge that he was accepting the plea only because he was unable to afford counsel. He attached documents to his Complaint. In one attachment, Complainant states that correspondence with the Subject Judge "has been ignored and/or returned" and a judgment was not rendered "in a reasonable amount of time."
Supplement
Complainant's supplemental statement consists of letters that do not directly pertain to the Subject Judge.

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."

All of Complainant's allegations, including the allegations of delay, concern the substance of the Subject Judge's official actions, findings, rulings, and orders in the case, and the allegations are directly related to the merits of the Subject Judge's decisions or procedural rulings.

The allegations of this Complaint are "directly related to the merits of a decision or procedural ruling," JCDR 11(c)(1)(B). For that reason, pursuant to Chapter 16 of Title 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii) and Rule 11(c)(1)(B) of the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States, this Complaint is **DISMISSED**.

Chief Judge