

MAY 21 2024

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-24-90050

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 Complainant filed a “Petition for Administrative Review” in which he alleged he was being denied access to the courts. The Subject Judge dismissed the case without prejudice under the three-strikes provision of the Prison Litigation Reform Act. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).

Complaint

Complainant alleges that the Subject Judge engaged in fraud, aided his false imprisonment, “associate[ed] my person to

fictitious identity,” denied him access to the court, was part of a conspiracy to prevent him from adjudicating his “liberty interest,” and violated his constitutional rights. He asserts “his name is not as used in any of the cases” the Subject Judge identified in applying section 1915(g).

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. § 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.

The Complaint fails to present a basis for a finding of misconduct. To the extent Complainant’s allegations concern the substance of the Subject Judge’s official actions, findings, and order in the above-described case, the allegations are directly related to the merits of the Subject Judge’s decisions or procedural rulings.

Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(B). Complainant's remaining claims are based on allegations lacking sufficient evidence to raise an inference that the Subject Judge engaged in misconduct. Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D). For these reasons, this Complaint is **DISMISSED**.

/s/ William H. Pryor Jr.
Chief Judge