

**FOR THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT**

11-21-90107

FILED
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT
JUDICIAL COUNCIL

MAR 02 2022

CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

**IN RE: COMPLAINT OF JUDICIAL
MISCONDUCT OR DISABILITY**


ON PETITION FOR REVIEW

Before: WILSON, ROSENBAUM, and BRANCH, Circuit Judges;
COOGLER and WALKER, Chief District Judges.

Pursuant to 11th Cir. JCDR 18.3, this Judicial Council Review Panel has considered petitioner's complaint filed on September 27, 2021, the order of Chief United States Circuit Judge William H. Pryor Jr. filed on November 22, 2021, and the petition for review filed by petitioner on December 1, 2021. No judge on this panel has requested that this matter be placed on the agenda of a meeting of the Judicial Council.

The Judicial Council Review Panel hereby AFFIRMS the disposition of this matter by Chief Judge Pryor. The petition for review is DENIED.

FOR THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL:


United States Circuit Judge

CONFIDENTIAL

**BEFORE THE CHIEF JUDGE
OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**

Judicial Complaint No. 11-21-90107

FILED
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

NOV 22 2021

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”).

Background

The record shows that in August 2021 Complainant filed a civil complaint against a defendant, alleging the defendant discriminated against him due to his disability and asserting that a former magistrate judge resigned because he failed to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act in a prior case Complainant had filed. A few days later, a magistrate judge issued a report recommending that the complaint be dismissed because the claims were barred by the doctrine of *res judicata*, noting that in a prior case, the court found the claims were untimely. Over Complainant’s objections, in September 2021 the Subject Judge issued an order adopting the report and recommendation and dismissing the case.

Complaint

In his Complaint of Judicial Misconduct or Disability, Complainant alleges the Subject Judge ignored facts and evidence and violated a state law on statutes of limitations. He also appears to allege the Subject Judge dismissed Complainant’s previous case because the Subject Judge did not want another judge to lose his job.

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 above-described case, 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 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