CONFIDENTIAL

FILED
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

JAN 13 2021

BEFORE THE CHIEF JUDGE OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

David J. Smith Clerk

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-20-90106 through 11-20-90111

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
and United States District Judges and of the United States District Court for the District of, and United
States Circuit Judges,, and of the United States
Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit, under the Judicial Conduct and
Disability Act of 1980, Chapter 16 of Title 28 U.S.C. §§ 351-364.
ODDED
ORDER
("Complainant") has filed this Complaint against United States
Magistrate Judge United States District Judges and , and
Magistrate Judge, United States District Judges and, and United States Circuit 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 Complainant has filed multiple lawsuits in the United States
District Court for the District of, and in those cases, Judges
have issued orders that, among other things, denied
Complainant's motions to proceed in forma pauperis (IFP), required him to file amended
complaints, and/or dismissed his complaints.
For example, in May 2018 Complainant filed a civil rights action against multiple
individuals, generally alleging the defendants violated his constitutional rights, and he
also filed a motion for leave to proceed IFP. The next month, Judge issued an
order dismissing the complaint without prejudice and directing the clerk to terminate any
pending motions, finding Complainant's claims were not viable under 42 U.S.C. § 1983
and the complaint failed to state a claim on which relief could be granted.
Complainant then filed a notice of appeal, a motion for relief from judgment or for
reconsideration, and a motion for leave to appeal IFP. In July 2018 Judge
issued orders denying the motion for relief from judgment and denying the motion to

appeal IFP. In April 2029	0 a panel of this Court composed of Judges,
, and	issued an opinion affirming the dismissal of his complaint
Complainant filed a petit	ion for rehearing, which the panel denied in July 2020.

Complaint

In his Complaint of Judicial Misconduct or Disability, Complainant generally takes issue with the orders and opinion issued by the Subject Judges in his cases and appeal, contending the decisions were erroneous and arbitrary. He alleges the Subject Judges showed "personal prejudice and bias," caused a miscarriage of justice, and aided and abetted constitutional violations committed by the defendants in his cases. He also states that "this action was retaliation based on the fact" that he included a certain document in an appendix in an appeal before this Court. He attached documents to his Complaint.

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, findings, rulings, orders, and opinion in Complainant's cases and appeal, 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 provide no credible facts or evidence in support of his claims that the Subject Judges were biased or prejudiced against him, aided and abetted constitutional violations, 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**.

/s/ William H. Pryor Jr.
Chief Judge