FILED U.S. COURT OF APPEALS ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

AUG 2 4 2017

CONFIDENTIAL

BEFORE THE CHIEF JUDGE OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

David J. Smith Clerk

Judicial Complaint No. 11-17-90020

IN THE MATTER OF A COMPLAINT FILED BY		
IN RE: The Complaint of the U.S. District Court for the Conduct and Disability Act of 19	District of	, under the Judicial
	ORDER	
——————————————————————————————————————	t Judge"), pursuant to (cial-Conduct and Judici	Chapter 16 of Title 28
As an initial matter, after Complesupplemental statements. The filing of 11th Cir. JCDR 6.7.	lainant filed his Compl f the supplemental state	aint, he filed two ments is permitted. <u>See</u>
Background		
The record shows that in Novem Complainant on one count of being a fee 2016, after multiple appointed attorney appointed to represent Complainant. Feas charged.	elon in possession of a vs had withdrawn from	firearm. In September the case, was
At a sentence hearing in January Complainant had filed a complaint aga wanted him to file legal objections that Subject Judge stated, "I think you're a for your clients." The Subject Judge th	inst him with a state be t did not beli great lawyer,	ar, and that Complainant leve were appropriate. The
[Complainant], you don't need reckoning. I don't know that y delays are fine, and I'm happy I don't see what's so legitimate to me. You are represented by o	you can do anything to to grant continuances about this. I don't the	delay it. Legitimate for legitimate delays. ink you ought to talk

Later in the hearing, the Subject Judge stated, "The taxpayers are done paying for you to go through six different lawyers. That is just absurd and ridiculous. It truly is." then informed the court that Complainant had requested that he "tell the Court that should Your Honor allow him to have a Position of the Parties Meeting, he will stay-," and the Subject Judge responded, "I'm not going to do that. That's garbage. Come on, [Complainant]. The answer is no." stated that Complainant had instructed him to request to withdraw as counsel of record, and the Subject Judge stated she would allow him withdraw. The Subject Judge added, "I'll just tell you, [Complainant], I'm done with lawyers. I'm done. And after this next person is appointed, you have a conflict with that person, that's your problem." She also stated, "You can't play us for fools here."
After the hearing, another attorney was appointed to represent Complainant. At a sentence hearing in March 2017, the Subject Judge sentenced Complainant to a term of 293 months of imprisonment.
Complaint
In his Complaint of Judicial Misconduct or Disability, Complainant alleges that the Subject Judge "mistreated" him at the hearing in January 2017. He contends that when the Subject Judge learned that he had complained to the state bar about, the Subject Judge "became extremely angry," accused him of "playing the government for a fool," and told him that "today was reckoning day for me." He notes that he wrote a "good cause" letter to the Subject Judge detailing the ineffective assistance of counsel was providing. Complainant then states that he was "denied the right to speak" at the hearing in violation of his First Amendment rights, and he later states that the Subject Judge "is siding against me without cause or reason."
Complainant complains that the Subject Judge did not questionabout his failure to follow certain procedures or to file objections to the Presentence Investigation Report (PSI). Complainant notes that the Subject Judge stated she had "seen my kind before," that was a good lawyer, and that she did not want to see "get into a situation over" Complainant. He states that he filed a complaint against the Subject Judge alleging "extreme bias and prejudice reasoning," and that he is fearful of being sentenced "unfairly and unjustly." Complainant requests that a different judge be assigned to his case. He attached documents to his Complaint, including a "Request for Good Cause" in which he generally took issue with failure to file objections to the PSI and requested that the Subject Judge provide him

more time to review the PSI.

Supplements

In his first supplemental statement, Complainant describes the circumstances of his arrest, takes issue with the actions of his attorneys, and alleges that his due process rights were violated in his criminal case. He complains that the Subject Judge attempted to sentence him in January 2017 even after he filed a good cause letter addressing issues of ineffective assistance of counsel. He states, "I truly feel my case has had 'bias and prejudice' motive since the beginning." In an attachment to the first supplement, Complainant states that the "court erred" in various respects in the case, including by sanctioning his "malicious arrest" and acting with a "bad motive toward [Complainant] through failure to adhere compliance with preexisting moral and ethical duties " He also contends that his sentence was "illegal" for various reasons.

In his second supplemental statement, Complainant alleges that the Subject Judge sentenced him "on bias and prejudice terms" and imposed a "vindictive sentence" on him. Complainant generally takes issue with the Subject Judge's decisions and rulings at the March 2017 sentence hearing, stating, among other things, that she overruled his objections even though they "were correctly raised and made with lawful grounds," and engaged in "[d]efamation of character and slandering" in describing his prior convictions. Complainant alleges that the Subject Judge knew she would not be able to handle his case without bias and prejudice, but refused to remove herself from the case. He attached various documents entitled "evidence of slandering statements and defamation of character" to his second supplement.

Discussion

Rule 3(h)(3)(A) of the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States provides that cognizable misconduct does not include "an allegation that is directly related to the merits of a decision or procedural ruling." The Rule provides that "[a]n allegation that calls into question the correctness of a judge's ruling, including a failure to recuse, without more, is merits-related." Id. The "Commentary on Rule 3" states in part:

Rule 3(h)(3)(A) 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 power by ensuring that the complaint procedure is not used to collaterally attack the substance of a judge's ruling. Any allegation that calls into question the correctness of an official action 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, rulings, and orders entered in the case, the allegations

are directly related to the merits of the Subject Judge's decisions or procedural rulings. Complainant's remaining allegations fail to raise an inference that the Subject Judge was biased or prejudiced against him, acted with an illicit or improper motive, treated him in a demonstrably egregious and hostile manner, imposed a vindictive sentence, or otherwise engaged in misconduct.

The allegations of this Complaint are "directly related to the merits of a decision or procedural ruling," JCDR 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," JCDR 11(c)(1)(D). For those reasons, pursuant to Chapter 16 of Title 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii) and (iii), and Rule 11(c)(1)(B) and (D) of the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States, this Complaint is **DISMISSED**.

Chief Judge