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

#### CONFIDENTIAL

APR 18 2022

David J. Smith Clerk

# Before the Chief Judge of the Eleventh Judicial Circuit

## Judicial Complaint No. 11-22-90025 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 July 2016 a federal grand jury issued an indictment charging Complainant with one count of being a felon in possession of a firearm and ammunition. Complainant later pleaded guilty to the charge, and the Subject Judge accepted the plea. In March 2017 the Subject Judge sentenced Complainant to a term of 96 months of imprisonment. Complainant appealed, and this Court later affirmed his conviction and sentence.

### Complaint

Complainant asserts the Subject Judge refused to allow him to introduce evidence about a confidential informant because the Subject Judge knew the informant was a convicted felon who was prohibited from possessing a firearm, and he contends the Subject Judge disregarded the law and engaged in misconduct by allowing the informant "to violate laws on a daily basis for years." Complainant alleges the Subject Judge was part of a conspiracy "to entrap dis[]advantaged minority citizens," helped law enforcement agencies "defraud the government and the public by creating crime to fund their hit squads," and engaged in improper *ex parte* communications.

#### Discussion

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. Ş 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. Complainant's remaining claims are based on allegations lacking sufficient evidence to raise an inference that the Subject Judge disregarded the law, was part of a conspiracy, engaged in improper *ex parte* communications, or otherwise 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