CONFIDENTIAL

BEFORE THE CHIEF JUDGE

OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

FILED U.S. COURT OF APPEALS ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

JUL 08 2019

David J. Smith Clerk

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-19-90012 through 11-19-90014

IN THE MATTER OF A COMPLAINT FILED BY
IN RE: The Complaint of against U.S. District Judge of the U.S. District Court for the District of and U.S. Circuit Judges and of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the
U.S. District Court for the District of and U.S. Circuit
Judges and of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the
Circuit, under the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980,
Chapter 16 of Title 28 U.S.C. §§ 351-364.
ORDER
("Complainant") has filed this Complaint against United States District Judge and United States Circuit Judges and (collectively, "the Subject Judges"), pursuant to Chapter 16 of Title 28 U.S.C. § 351(a) and the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States ("JCDR").
Background
The record shows that in May 2017 Complainant filed a civil rights complaint against multiple defendants, and he moved for leave to proceed in forma pauperis (IFP). After that, a magistrate judge granted the IFP motion and directed Complainant to file an amended complaint. In August 2017 Complainant filed a motion to dismiss the case without prejudice and to be relieved of the obligation to pay the filing fee. In October 2017 Judge entered an order granting Complainant's motion to voluntarily dismiss the case and denying the request to be relieved of paying the remainder of the filing fee, and a judgment was entered the next day.
Complainant filed a motion for relief from judgment, seeking to reopen the case in a different court, and filed a notice of appeal. In January 2018 Judge entered an order denying the motion for relief from judgment, finding that Complainant failed to demonstrate grounds for the court to disturb the judgment and that it would be futile for the court to reopen and/or transfer the case. The next month, Complainant filed in the district court a "Petition for En Banc Rehearing" seeking review of Judge annuary 2018 order. A few months later, Judge entered an order carrying the petition with the case pending resolution of Complainant's appeal.

In September 2018 a panel of this Court composed of Judges and		
remanded the case to the district court for the limited purpose of allowing it		
to address the Petition for En Banc Rehearing. The next month, Judge		
entered an order denying Complainant's Petition for En Banc Rehearing, finding there		
was no provision for en banc rehearing in the district court and that, to the extent		
Complainant sought reconsideration of the January 2018 order, he raised no new		
arguments or evidence warranting reconsideration. After that, Complainant filed multiple		
motions seeking various types of relief, including a motion to amend his filings, and		
Judge denied the motions. In May 2019 a panel of this Court that included		
Judges and dismissed Complainant's appeal as frivolous.		
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		
<u>Complaint</u>		
In his Complaint of Judicial Misconduct or Disability, Complainant takes issue		
with Judge order denying his Petition for En Banc Rehearing and this Court's		
order remanding the matter to the district court. He asserts that the Subject Judges "had		
to have known that the appropriate court for handling and jurisdiction was" the circuit		
court, and that their "handling of the petition only frustrated the court system and		
prejudiced" his case. Complainant states that his petition should have been forwarded to		
the circuit court or returned unfiled.		
Complainant also contends that the district court abused its discretion by not		
providing him an opportunity to amend his filing and that the denial of his motion to		
amend and motion to reopen were biased. In an attached document, Complainant alleges		
that Judge "attempted to manipulate the proceeding" by dismissing his		
Petition for En Banc Rehearing, which he had erroneously filed in the district court.		

Discussion

Rule 4(b)(1) of the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States, "Allegations Related to the Merits of a Decision or Procedural Ruling," 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" states in part:

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.

To the extent	Complainant's allegations concern the substance of the Subject
Judges' official action	ons, rulings, findings, and orders in Complainant's case and appeal,
the allegations are d	irectly related to the merits of the Subject Judges' decisions or
	Apart from the decisions or procedural rulings with which
	ssue, he provides no credible facts or evidence in support of his
claims that Judge	was biased against him or that the Subject Judges otherwise
engaged in any misc	conduct.

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