## **CONFIDENTIAL**

JAN 22 2020

## BEFORE THE CHIEF JUDGE OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

David J. Smith Clerk

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-19-90078 and 11-19-90079

IN THE MATTER OF A COMPLAINT FILED BY
IN RE: The Complaint of against former United States Magistrate
Judge and United States District Judge of the United States
District Court for the District of under the Judicial
Judge and United States District Judge of the United States District Court for the District of, 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 former United States  Magistrate Judge and United States District Judge (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"). Judge retired as a magistrate judge in
Background
The record shows that in 2012 Complainant filed a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action against multiple defendants, generally alleging that they were deliberately indifferent to his serious medical needs after he fell and was injured at his place of incarceration. Among other things, he alleged that a Registered Nurse,, failed to order an x-ray of his neck despite his complaint of neck pain. In January 2013 the case was transferred to the United States District Court for the District of In November 2013 Judge issued a report recommending that the action be dismissed. Over Complainant's objections, in June 2014 Judge adopted the report and recommendation, and the case was dismissed. Complainant appealed.
In September 2015 this Court issued an opinion affirming in part and reversing and remanding in part. This Court held, among other things, that: (1) Complainant sufficiently stated a claim against and two other defendants for delaying diagnosis and treatment of his neck and back injuries; (2) he stated a claim against those defendants and another one for failing to treat his pain; and (3) the district court erred in dismissing his complaint without giving him at least one opportunity to amend.

	After that, Complainant filed an amended complaint in the district court. In March 2016 Judge issued a supplemental report recommending that certain claims be dismissed and the remaining claims be referred to him for further proceedings. The next month, Judge entered an order adopting the recommendation, dismissing certain claims, and referring other claims to Judge for further proceedings.
	After that, Judge entered an order directing the defendants to submit special reports in response to Complainant's initial and amended complaints. The defendants filed answers and special reports. In April 2017 Judge notified the parties that the special reports would be construed as motions for summary judgment. Complainant later filed a response.
	In February 2018 Judge issued a report recommending that the motions for summary judgment be granted as to all defendants and claims and that the action be dismissed with prejudice. Judge generally found that there was no evidence creating a genuine dispute of material fact with respect to the claims that the defendants were deliberately indifferent to Complainant's serious medical needs. Among other things, Judge found that although did not order an x-ray of Complainant's neck, the absence of evidence of serious injury in the x-rays of the rest of his body could reasonably lead a medical practitioner to believe that only conservative treatment was necessary. Over Complainant's objections, in May 2018 Judge adopted the report and recommendation and entered a final judgment granting the
	defendants' motions for summary judgment and dismissing the case with prejudice.  Complaint
·	In his Complaint of Judicial Misconduct or Disability, Complainant alleges that the Subject Judges intentionally violated his constitutional rights to a fair and impartial hearing and to have his issues properly adjudicated. He contends that the Subject Judges violated the "Judicial canon[]s of ethics and candor" and their oaths of office, as well as committed "intentional, malic[i]ous, wanton, egregious acts and omissions."
	Complainant asserts that Judge used "deception" to answer his complaint "on behalf of" According to Complainant, he alleged that lied to him about x-rays of his neck when she did not order a neck x-ray, and she did not address that claim during the case. He asserts that Judge acknowledged in his report and recommendation that no neck x-ray was ordered but covered up and answered for by "making his own non-medical, unqualified opinion" that she acted reasonably. He argues that a medical professional cannot assume a negative x-ray of one part of the body establishes that an x-ray of another part of the body would be negative. Complainant alleges that Judge used his "outlandish" opinion to "erroneously" grant summary judgment in favor of

He also generally contends that he established a dispute of material fact with respect to his claims against
Complainant alleges that Judge erroneously adopted Judge "clearly tainted and bias[ed] opinion." He states that Judge "should have reasonably known" that Judge acts and omissions violated Complainant's constitutional rights and ethical canons. Complainant seeks to have this Court overturn the Subject Judges' "biased" rulings and to have them recused from the case.
Discussion
<u>Judge</u>
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 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 as to the subject judge." About 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 his retirement, "intervening events render some or all of the allegations moot or make remedial action impossible," JCDR 11(e). For that 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
Judge
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 Judge
official actions, findings, rulings, and orders in the case, the allegations are
directly related to the merits of Judge decisions or procedural rulings. Apart
from the decisions or procedural rulings with which Complainant takes issue, he provides no credible facts or evidence in support of his claims that Judge was biased
against him, acted with an illicit or improper motive, or otherwise engaged in misconduct.
Therefore, to the extent the Complaint concerns Judge, 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 to the extent it concerns Judge
- AA
7 Clams
Chief Judge