CONFIDENTIAL

FILED
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT
AUG 20 2021
David J. Smith
Clerk

BEFORE THE CHIEF JUDGE OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-21-90063 and 11-21-90064

IN THE MATTER OF A COMPLAINT FILED BY	
IN RE: The Complaint of	against United States Magistrate Judges
and	of the United States District Court for the
District of, unc	of the United States District Court for theler the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980,
Chapter 16 of Title 28 U.S	.C. §§ 351-364.
	ORDER
Magistrate Judge and pursuant to Chapter 16 of Title 28 Judicial-Disability Proceedings of the state of the s	t") has filed this Complaint against United States (collectively, the "Subject Judges"), B U.S.C. § 351(a) and the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and f the Judicial Conference of the United States ("JCDR"). as a magistrate judge in
•	Complainant filed his Complaint, he filed a supplemental lemental statement is permitted. See 11th Cir. JCDR
Background	
District Court for the writ of habeas corpus challenging involving minors. Later that more	anuary 2019 Complainant filed in the United States District of a 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition for a g multiple state court convictions for sex offenses hth, the case was transferred to the United States District of, and in March 2019 Judge gned to the case.
convictions on four grounds. Aft issued a report recommending the evidentiary hearing, finding each defaulted. Over Complainant's of	the filed an amended § 2254 petition challenging his the various proceedings, in May 2021 Judge at the amended § 2254 petition be denied without an ground raised was successive, untimely, or procedurally objections, a district judge entered an order adopting the denying the amended § 2254 petition

Complaint

In his Complaint of Judicial Misconduct or Disability, Complainant states that in 1986 or 1987 he was a "one hour photo lab" technician and "developed some rolls of film showing nude children, one in what amounts to a sexual act." He states the film was provided by Judge (before he was a judge) and another individual, and that Complainant was eventually criminally charged in connection with the photos.
Complainant then takes issue with Judge findings in his habeas proceedings. He alleges that Judge: (1) committed perjury and made false statements in her report and recommendation to protect Judge from Complainant's allegations concerning the photos; and (2) violated his rights of access to non-biased court and violated his constitutional rights. He also takes issue with his state court proceedings and the actions of individuals other than the Subject Judges. He attached documents to his Complaint.
Supplement
In his supplemental statement, Complainant takes issue with an order issued by a district judge who is not one of the Subject Judges. He also reiterates his allegations that Judge, blocked Complainant' access to a non-biased court, and violated his constitutional and civil rights. He attached documents to his supplement.
<u>Discussion</u>
Judge
Rule 1(b) of the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States provides, "A covered judge is defined under the Act and is limited to judges of United States courts of appeals, judges of United States district courts, judges of United States bankruptcy courts, United States magistrate judges, and judges of the courts specified in 28 U.S.C. § 363." See also 28 U.S.C. § 351(d)(1) (defining "judge" as "a circuit judge, district judge, bankruptcy judge, or magistrate judge").
Complainant's allegations against Judge concern his actions before he became a United States magistrate judge, and they are not cognizable under the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States.
Thus, to the extent the Complaint concerns Judge, the Complaint is "not appropriate for consideration under the Act," JCDR 11(c)(1)(G). For that reason,

pursuant to Chapter 16 of Title 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(i) and Rule 11(c)(1)(G) of the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States, this Complaint is DISMISSED to the extent it concerns Judge The dismissal of this Complaint in no way implies that there is any merit to Complainant's allegations against Judge
Judge
Rule 4(b)(1) of the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings, "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 Judge official actions, findings, report, and recommendations in the above-described case, the allegations are directly related to the merits of Judge decisions or procedural rulings. Apart from the decisions or procedural rulings that Complainant challenges, he provides no credible facts or evidence in support of his claims that Judge knowingly made false statements, committed perjury, acted to cover up allegations, was biased, or otherwise engaged in misconduct.
To the extent the Complaint concerns Judge, the allegations of the 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 to the extent it concerns Judge
/s/ William H. Pryor Jr. Chief Judge