## **CONFIDENTIAL**

FILED
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT
APR 2 1 2021
David J. Smith
Clerk

## BEFORE THE CHIEF JUDGE OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-21-90002 and 11-21-90003

IN THE MATTER OF A COMPLAINT FILED BY \_\_\_\_\_

IN RE: The Complaint of against United States District Judges and of the United States District Court for the District of, under the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980,
and 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 United States  District 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 August 2018 Complainant filed an employment discrimination action against the ("the"), who was represented by attorneys from the United States Attorney's Office. After various proceedings, in May 2019 Complainant filed a second amended complaint raising two claims stemming from the defendant's failure to hire him for jobs under two vacancy announcements, and the defendant filed a motion to dismiss. In January 2020 Judge issued an order granting the motion to dismiss and dismissing the claims raised in the second amended complaint with prejudice, generally finding that Complainant failed to state a claim on which relief could be granted.
Complainant then filed, among other things, multiple motions to reopen the case based on newly discovered evidence and a motion for sanctions. In the motions, Complainant contended that: (1) the defendant provided a "fraudulent" response to an inquiry under the Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA"); (2) the response established that the second job vacancy announcement was "fake" and "fraudulently created," as the defendant lacked the authority to create the position; and (3) counsel for the defendant committed fraud by concealing the evidence and misrepresented facts in responses.
In July 2020 Judge issued an order denying the motions to reopen, motion for sanctions, and other motions Complainant had filed, generally finding he did

not establish entitlement to the relief sought and failed to prove by clear and convincing evidence that the defendant engaged in fraud, misrepresentation, or other misconduct. The order also instructed Complainant to cease filing frivolous motions in the case and stated that, if he continued to do so, the court would entertain a motion by the defendant to revoke his CM/ECF access, impose sanctions against him, issue a filing injunction against him, or issue similar relief.

After that, Complainant filed, among other things, a motion to reopen the case based on newly discovered evidence, arguing that, in another case, Judgeacknowledged that the defendant provided fraudulent documentation in the case and fraudulently misrepresented facts in filings. In March 2021 Judge entered an order denying Complainant's motion to reopen and other motions he had filed, finding in part that he failed to prove by clear and convincing evidence that the defendant engaged in fraud, misrepresentation, or other misconduct. Complainant has filed additional motions to reopen the case.
The record shows that in June 2020 Complainant filed a "Freedom of Information Act Complaint" against the and another defendant, seeking the release of agency records that he alleged were improperly withheld from him. The defendants moved to dismiss the case. In late July 2020, Judge issued an order: (1) discussing Complainant's assertions concerning the allegedly fraudulent response to the FOIA request; (2) finding the complaint failed to state a claim for relief under the FOIA; and (3) granting the defendants' motion to dismiss.
After that, Complainant filed, among other things, an amended complaint against two new defendants and motions to recuse and disqualify Judge, and the defendants filed a motion to dismiss. Judge issued orders denying the motions to recuse and disqualify. In February 2021 Judge issued an order granting the motion to dismiss and dismissing Complainant's claims, some with prejudice and some without prejudice. The order stated that, if Complainant attempted to replead certain claims, he must file an amended complaint within 14 days. In late February 2021 Judge entered an order directing the clerk to enter judgment for the defendants because no amended complaint was filed in a timely manner. The next month, Complainant filed a motion to reopen, which Judge denied.
The record also shows that in October 2020 Complainant filed a "Miscellaneous Case Requesting Declaratory Relief," requesting that the court declare that Judge acknowledged that theprovided fraudulent documents that prove thecreated a fake job vacancy announcement to deny him employment opportunities. In January 2021 Judge issued an order denying the request for declaratory relief without prejudice to his right to initiate a civil action by filing a complaint. Complainant then filed a motion to reopen the case and for Judge

recusal, and in February 2021 Judge entered an order denying the motion to recuse for failure to provide a sufficient factual basis to support his claims against her.
Complaint
In his Complaint of Judicial Misconduct or Disability, Complainant alleges that Judge deliberately delayed issuing a ruling in his miscellaneous case. He asserts that Judge delay arose "out of an improper motive to conspire with [Judge] to cover up the fraudulent misrepresentation of facts" by the United States Attorney concerning a fraudulent FOIA response. Complainant asserts that in July 2020 Judge acknowledged that the FOIA response was fraudulent, but "refused to turn over that information to" Judge
Next, Complainant takes issue with Judge denial of his fourth motion to reopen and for sanctions against the Assistant United States Attorney based on fraud. He asserts that Judge then attempted to prevent him from filing a motion to reopen based on newly discovered evidence by threatening him in her July 2020 order. He attached documents to his Complaint.
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 —

To the extent Complainant's allegations concern the substance of the Subject Judges' official actions, findings, rulings, and orders in the cases, the allegations are directly related to the merits of the Subject Judges' decisions or procedural rulings. Complainant's remaining claims are based on allegations lacking sufficient evidence to raise an inference that Judge \_\_\_\_\_ acted with an improper or illicit motive, that the Subject Judges were part of a conspiracy, or that the Subject Judges otherwise engaged in misconduct.

without more — is merits-related.

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**.

/s/ William H. Pryor Jr.
Chief Judge