#### FILED U.S. COURT OF APPEALS ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

### APR 18 2022

## CONFIDENTIAL

David J. Smith Clerk

# Before the Chief Judge of the Eleventh Judicial Circuit

# Judicial Complaint No. 11-22-90024 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, 28 U.S.C. §§ 351-364.

# ORDER

("Complainant") has filed this Complaint against United States District Judge ("the Subject Judge"), under the Act, 28 U.S.C. § 351(a), and the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States ("Judicial-Conduct Rules").

### Background

The record shows that in November 2014 Complainant filed an employment discrimination action against her former employer and filed a third amended complaint in May 2016.<sup>1</sup> In March 2017 the defendant filed a motion for summary judgment. After various proceedings, in September 2019 the Subject Judge issued an opinion and order granting the defendant's motion for summary judgment in part. In February 2020 the Subject Judge issued a supplemental opinion dismissing Complainant's remaining claim for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction, and the case was closed.

## Complaint

Complainant states she "filed a complaint against the judge because she refused to believe all the information that I provided," and that "the court" has continued to protect her former employer "along with their continued pattern of illegal behavior under the RICO Act." She states her former employer committed fraud on the court, which "resulted in [the court's] inability to perform its task without bias and prejudice," and that "the court" failed to consider certain testimony. She also takes issue with the treatment she received from her former employer and with the actions of individuals other than the Subject Judge.

### Discussion

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The lawsuit was filed by \_\_\_\_\_, which appears to be Complainant's previous name.

Judicial-Conduct Rule 4(b)(1) 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 explains the rationale for this rule as follows:

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, and orders in the above-described case, the allegations are directly related to the merits of the Subject Judge's decisions or procedural rulings. Apart from the decisions or procedural rulings that Complainant challenges, she provides no credible facts or evidence in support of a claim that the Subject Judge engaged in misconduct.

The allegations of this Complaint are "directly related to the merits of a decision or procedural ruling," under Judicial-Conduct Rule 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," under Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D). For those reasons, this Complaint is **DISMISSED**.

/s/ William H. Pryor Jr. Chief Judge