

FILED  
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT  
JUDICIAL COUNCIL

APR 25 2024

CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Judicial Council of the  
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

---

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-23-90154 and 11-23-90155

---

ORDER

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

Pursuant to 11th Cir. JCDR 18.3, this Judicial Council Review Panel has considered the materials described in JCDR 18(c)(2), including petitioner's complaint, the order of Chief United States Circuit Judge William H. Pryor Jr., and the petition for review filed by petitioner. 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.

Done this 25<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2024.

FOR THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL:



United States Circuit Judge

DEC 18 2023

David J. Smith  
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the  
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

---

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-23-90154 and 11-23-90155

---

**ORDER**

An individual has filed a Complaint against a United States magistrate judge and 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 Complainant filed a civil-rights complaint against two defendants and a motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The Subject Magistrate Judge granted the *in forma pauperis* motion, found the complaint failed to state a claim, and gave Complainant an opportunity to file an amended complaint. Complainant then filed an amended complaint, and the Subject Magistrate Judge issued a report recommending that the amended complaint be dismissed with prejudice. The case remains pending.

## **Complaint**

Complainant states that the Subject Magistrate Judge did not have subject-matter jurisdiction, her report and recommendation “should be ruled invalid and without merit,” the cases she cited were “not valid,” and she interfered with his civil-rights complaint. Complainant does not raise any allegations concerning the Subject District 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 Judges engaged in misconduct. Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D). For that reason, this Complaint is **DISMISSED**.

/s/ William H. Pryor Jr.  
Chief Judge