CONFIDENTIAL

FILED
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

OCT 0 2 2018

BEFORE THE ACTING CHIEF JUDGE OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT David J. Smith Clerk

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-18-90046 through 11-18-90057

IN THE MATTER OF A COMPLAINT FILED BY _____

IN RE: The Complaint of against United States Magistrate Judge			
and United States District Judge of the United States			
District Court for the District of , and United States Circuit			
Judges,,,,,,,			
,, and of the United States Court of			
Judges,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			
of 1980, Chapter 16 of Title 28 U.S.C. §§ 351-364.			
ORDER			
("Complainant") has filed this Complaint against I Inited States			
("Complainant") has filed this Complaint against United States Magistrate Judge United States District Judge and United States			
Magistrate Judge, United States District Judge, and United States			
circuit Judges,,,,			
Circuit Judges,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			
and Judicial Disability Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States			
and Judicial-Disability Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States			
("JCDR"). Judge retired in			
As an initial matter, after Complainant filed his Complaint, he filed two			
supplemental statements. The filing of the supplemental statements is permitted. See			
11th Cir. JCDR 6.7.			
Background			
The record shows that in June 2017 Complainant, on behalf of himself, his unborn			
child, and a class of unborn children, filed a "Petition for Extraordinary Relief by			
Mandamus, Procendendo and Verified Complaint for Injunctive, Declaratory Relief"			
against a state and other defendants. Complainant, among other things, alleged that he			
had been deprived of his ability to assert his parental rights and denied a guardian ad			
litem in violation of his constitutional rights, and he sought injunctive and other relief.			
He also filed a motion to proceed in forma pauperis (IFP). Judge entered an			

order granting the IFP motion and directing the clerk to submit the matter to the district

court for a frivolity determination under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).

Later in June 2017, Judge entered an order denying Complainant's				
request for a preliminary injunction and dismissing the case pursuant to § 1915(e)(2).				
Judge found that Complainant's unborn child lacked standing to sue in his				
own right, and that Complainant otherwise did not establish he was entitled to the relief he sought. Complainant then filed, among other things, a motion for reconsideration in				
an order denying the motion for reconsideration, finding Complainant did not establish a				
basis for reconsideration, and denying his remaining motions as moot. In a footnote,				
Judge stated that although Congress used the word "prisoner" in § 1915, the				
Circuit has held that the statute also applies to non-prisoner indigent litigants.				
Complainant appealed.				
-re-F				
Complainant then filed in the circuit court an emergency motion for a ruling by a				
three-judge panel, which a panel comprised of Judges,, and				
denied. In September 2017 Complainant filed a document entitled				
"Emergency Preliminary Injunction," which a panel comprised of Judges,				
, and denied. In February 2018 a panel comprised of Judges				
, and affirmed the district court's dismissal of				
Complainant's case. The panel held that: (1) the district court's application of				
§1915(e)(2)(B)(i) was constitutional; (2) the court did not abuse its discretion by				
dismissing the complaint without opportunity to amend; and (3) Complainant abandoned				
his remaining arguments. Complainant filed a petition for rehearing en banc and a				
motion for the certification of questions to the Supreme Court, which the panel comprised				
of Judges, and denied.				
or Judges, and defined.				
The record shows that in August 2017 Complainant, on behalf of his unborn child,				
filed: (1) a "Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus" in which he alleged that his child was				
being deprived of constitutional rights in certain state court proceedings; (2) a motion to				
proceed IFP; and (3) an emergency motion for injunctive relief. On the same day, Judge				
granted the IFP motion and directed the clerk to submit the matter to the				
district court for a frivolity determination under § 1915(e)(2).				
district court for a firvointy actornimation under § 1915(c)(2).				
A couple of days later, Judge entered an order dismissing the action				
and denying the request for emergency relief, finding the action was identical to the				
previous action Complainant had filed and that the petition identified no new				
circumstances that warranted reconsideration of the court's prior ruling. Complainant				
filed a motion for reconsideration, which Judge denied, finding Complainant				
was not entitled to habeas relief as he was not in custody. Complainant filed a notice of				
appeal.				
On appeal, Complainant filed a motion for an extension of time to file his brief				
and for free aggest to documents on BACED. In November 2017 Judge				

entered an order granting in part the request for an extension of time and denying the motion for free access to PACER. Later that month, the circuit court clerically dismissed the appeal for want of prosecution due to Complainant's failure to timely file a brief.

The record shows that in September 2017 Complainant and his newborn child filed a lawsuit against Judges,, and others, alleging in part that the defendants violated his right of access to the courts and conspired to deprive him of his rights. He also filed a motion to proceed IFP, and a magistrate judge who is not one of the Subject Judges granted the IFP motion and directed the clerk to submit the action to the district court for review under § 1915(e)(2)(B).		
In late September 2017 Complainant filed in the circuit court a petition for writ of mandamus and prohibition, seeking to have the district court expedite the proceedings and to immediately process and issue summons. He also filed a motion to proceed IFP. The next month, he filed a motion to stay certain state court proceedings, which a panel comprised of Judges, and denied. In November 2017 Judge denied Complainant's IFP motion because his petition was frivolous. After that, the circuit court clerically dismissed the petition for want of prosecution.		
In April 2018 in the district court, a district judge who is not one of the Subject Judges dismissed Complainant's complaint, finding the claims: (1) against the defendant judges were barred by the doctrine of absolute judicial immunity; (2) against another defendant were barred by the doctrine of quasi-judicial immunity; and (3) for injunctive relief could not be granted against any of the defendants. The order also denied a motion Complainant had filed requesting to file pleadings electronically.		
Finally, the record shows that in October 2017 Complainant filed in a district court in a lawsuit against multiple defendants, and he moved to proceed IFP. Later that month, a district judge denied an emergency motion for injunctive relief Complainant had filed and transferred the case to the United States District Court for the District of After that, Judges and recused themselves from the case. A magistrate judge who is not one of the Subject Judges then granted Complainant's motion to proceed IFP and directed the clerk to submit the action to the district court for review under § 1915(e)(2)(B). Complainant then filed, among other things, a motion requesting access to the court's electronic filing system.		

$\underline{Complaint}$

In his Complaint of Judicial Misconduct or Disability, Complainant generally alleges that pro se and indigent litigants are not treated fairly in the courts, and he complains that his claims were reviewed under the PLRA despite that he is not a prisoner, in violation of his constitutional rights. He states that indigent litigants: (1) have their cases "summarily dismissed and silenced by Judicial Legislative process not detailed in

effects to censor their voice by attrition"; and (3) "do not get equal notice in modern day ECF terms." Next, Complainant alleges that district judges, "[p]rimarily" Judges and , "acted in a repugnant & vile manner towards a US Citizen" exercising his First Amendment rights to petition for redress, and acted "arbitrarily & egregiously ursurpting [sic] Article III power to war against 'We the People.'" Complainant alleges that the circuit court Subject Judges: (1) "do not act under obligation of Original Constitutional contract, but rather under malice, discontent . . . "; (2) "further[ed] the illegal scheme by ignoring fundamental Constitutional protections and the Rule of Constitutional Law"; and (3) "uph[eld] Judicial Legislation" in applying the PLRA to non-prisoners. In a footnote, he states that "[n]umerous _____ Circuit judges have worked in concert to deprive me of a relationship with my child." Complainant then takes issue with the transfer of one of his cases from to _____, and alleges that the United States District Court for the **District** has not responded to his objections to the transfer and continued to act despite a notice of appeal being filed, which constituted a "flagrant usurpation of judicial power." He contends that the Subject Judges are not entitled to judicial immunity and that their rulings are void. He then takes issue with the actions of individuals other than the Subject Judges, complains that he has not been permitted to file documents electronically, and asserts that "the Clerk and the Court" consistently act in bad faith towards indigent litigants. He attached various documents to his Complaint. **Supplements** In his first supplemental statement, Complainant takes issue with the processing of certain documents he submitted to the circuit court, contending that the return of one of his motions should be added to the "list of evil-handed malfeasance occurring in the Circuit living room." He also asks, "are opioids being used?" He attached documents to the supplement. In the second supplement, Complainant takes issue with the processing of his documents in the district court. He attached documents to the second supplement. Discussion Judge Rule 11(e) of the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States provides, "The chief judge may conclude

Federal Rules of Civil Procedures"; (2) are "injured and retaliated against with consorted

a complaint proceeding in whole or in part upon determining that intervening events render some or all of the allegations moot or make remedial action impossible." With

respect to this rule, the "Commentary on Rule 11" states in part, "Rule 11(e) implements Section 352(b)(2) of the Act, which permits the chief judge to 'conclude the proceeding' if 'action on the complaint is no longer necessary because of intervening events,' such as a resignation from judicial office."
To the extent the Complaint concerns Judge, in light of Judge, retirement, "intervening events render some or all of the allegations moot or make remedial action impossible," JCDR 11(e). For this reason, pursuant to Chapter 16 of Title 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(2) and Rule 11(e) of the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States, this Complaint proceeding is CONCLUDED to the extent it concerns Judge The conclusion of this proceeding in no way implies that there is any merit to Complainant's allegations against Judge
The Remaining Subject Judges
Rule 3(h)(3)(A) 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." <u>Id.</u> 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 Judges
,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
in support of his allegations that Judges,,, and, and acted with an illicit or improper motive, were biased against Complainant or
acted with an illicit or improper motive, were biased against Complainant or indigent litigants, or otherwise engaged in misconduct.
With respect to Judges,,, and

, the allegations of this Complaint decision or procedural ruling," and the Complesufficient evidence to raise an inference that nexists." For those reasons, pursuant to Chapte and (iii), and Rule 11(c)(1)(B) and (D) of the Disability Proceedings of the Judicial Confere DISMISSED to the extent it concerns Judges	misconduct has occurred or that a disability er 16 of Title 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii) Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-ence of the United States, this Complaint is
and	
	Acting Chief Judge