

MAY 22 2024

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-24-90071

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 the Subject Judge was assigned to a criminal case in which a former political office holder is one of the defendants. The Subject Judge has issued various orders in the case, and the case remains pending.

Complaint

Complainant states the Subject Judge “has shown an amazing combination of bias and incompetence,” that, “[a]s a judge who owes her lifetime appointment to [a defendant in the above-

described case] her impartiality is certainly questionable,” and that her “rulings and delays have made it quite clear that she is intent on delaying this trial until well after the election.” Complainant states the Subject Judge “has refused to set a trial date,” despite that both parties have suggested certain months for a trial. Complainant asserts that the Subject Judge has “eight substantive pending motions” that need to be ruled upon, and that “at least four or five could have been ruled on.”

Next, Complainant contends the Subject Judge has ruled in favor of the defendant “at almost every opportunity,” and she states, “Whether this is blatant bias, incompetence due to inexperience or a combination of both, it is clear she is not qualified to adjudicate this case and should be removed” and replaced by a different judge. Finally, Complainant notes that the Subject Judge had a “previous ruling concerning this overturned by” this Court.

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.

Furthermore, Judicial-Conduct Rule 4(b)(2) provides that cognizable misconduct does not include “an allegation about delay in rendering a decision or ruling, unless the allegation concerns an improper motive in delaying a particular decision or habitual delay in a significant number of unrelated cases.” The “Commentary on Rule 4” states that “a complaint of delay in a single case is excluded as merits-related.”

To the extent the Complaint requests that the Subject Judge be removed from the above-described case and that the case be re-assigned to a different judge, neither the Chief Circuit Judge nor the Judicial Council has the authority to take this action under the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings. *See* Judicial-Conduct Rule 11 (Chief Judge's Review); Judicial-Conduct Rule 19 (Judicial-Council Disposition of Petition for Review); Judicial-Conduct Rule 20 (Judicial-Council Action Following Appointment of Special Committee).

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, rulings, 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. 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 was biased, acted with an illicit or improper motive, is incompetent, or otherwise engaged in misconduct. Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D). *See Straw v. United States*, 4 F.4th 1358, 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2021) ("There is no support whatsoever for the contention that a judge can be disqualified based simply on the identity of the President who appointed him."). Although this complaint process is not the appropriate way to seek review of the Subject Judge's orders, her orders are nevertheless subject to appellate review in the normal course.

For these reasons, this Complaint is **DISMISSED**.

/s/ William H. Pryor Jr.
Chief Judge