

JUN 26 2023

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-23-90083

ORDER

An individual has filed a Complaint against a United States district judge under the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980, 28 U.S.C. §§ 351–364, and the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States.

Background

The record shows that over a 7-year period Complainant has been the plaintiff in 17 cases in the Subject Judge's district, 6 of which were assigned a certain district judge and 11 of which were assigned to another district judge. The Subject Judge was not assigned to any of Complainant's cases.

Complaint

Complainant alleges that the Subject Judge, as a former chief judge, was responsible for assigning a majority of cases

Complainant filed, all of his cases were assigned to only two judges, it is “obvious that there’s some serious foul play going on,” and “courts are deliberately assigning cases to certain judges.” He asserts that “agents and others” in the district conspired with another district “to send an innocent man to prison,” which was why the assigned judges “are trying their best to keep this case from being exposed.” He states that “judges are cheating,” none of his cases “ever got as far as the summons stage,” none of this cases “had a chance,” and they “were dead the moment he filed them.” He also appears to allege he was discriminated against due to his race, and he takes issue with the actions of individuals other than the Subject Judge.

Discussion

The Complaint fails to present a basis for a finding of misconduct. Complainant’s claims are based on allegations lacking sufficient evidence to raise an inference that the Subject Judge caused cases to be improperly assigned, acted with an illicit or improper motive, was part of a conspiracy, discriminated against Complainant due to his race, or otherwise engaged in misconduct. Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D). *See Dietz v. Bouldin*, 579 U.S. 40, 45 (2016) (“[T]his Court has long recognized that a district court possesses inherent powers that are governed not by rule or statute but by the control necessarily vested in courts to manage their own affairs so as to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases.” (quotation omitted)); *United States v. Stone*, 411 F.2d 597, 598-99 (5th Cir. 1969) (“District judges may by rule, order or consent transfer cases between themselves. Each judge of a multi-district court

has the same power and authority as each other judge. Moreover, District Judges have the inherent power to transfer cases from one to another for the expeditious administration of justice.” (citations omitted)). For these reasons, this Complaint is **DISMISSED**.

/s/ William H. Pryor Jr.
Chief Judge