

FEB 15 2022

David J. Smith  
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the  
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

---

Judicial Complaint No. 11-22-90009

IN THE MATTER OF A COMPLAINT FILED BY:

---

IN RE: The Complaint of \_\_\_\_\_ against United States District  
Judge \_\_\_\_\_ of the United States District Court for the  
\_\_\_\_\_ District of \_\_\_\_\_, under the Judicial Conduct and  
Disability Act of 1980, 28 U.S.C. §§ 351-364.

---

**ORDER**

\_\_\_\_\_ (“Complainant”) has filed this Complaint against  
United States District Judge \_\_\_\_\_ ( “the Subject Judge”), un-  
der the Act, 28 U.S.C. § 351(a), and the Rules for Judicial-Conduct  
and Judicial-Disability Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of  
the United States (“Judicial-Conduct Rules”).

## **Background**

The record shows that in April 2008 Complainant pled guilty to one count of being a felon in possession of a firearm, and in July 2008 a district judge who is not the Subject Judge sentenced him to a term of 112 months of imprisonment to be followed by 3 years of supervised release. After additional proceedings, the case was re-assigned to the Subject Judge in July 2017, and subsequently re-assigned to a different district judge in September 2018.

In August 2020 Complainant filed a “Motion for Production Order to Resolve Pending Charges” in which he requested relief in connection with a “Probation Revocation.” The next month, he filed a motion seeking to dismiss a “Probation Revocation Hearing.” In October 2020 he filed a motion in which he alleged the court had hindered him from being released from custody. In January 2021 a district judge who is not the Subject Judge entered an order denying Complainant’s motions, noting that he mistakenly referred to supervised release revocation proceedings as “probation revocation,” and generally finding he did not establish he was entitled to the relief sought.

## **Complaint**

Complainant states he seeks to have his “probation” dismissed “because the time has expired,” and he asserts the Subject Judge “refused to answer” his motions seeking dismissal of his probation in violation of federal rules and his constitutional rights.

### **Discussion**

Complainant provides no credible facts or evidence in support of a claim that the Subject Judge engaged in misconduct.

The Complaint “is based on allegations lacking sufficient evidence to raise an inference that misconduct has occurred or that a disability exists,” under Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D). For that reason, this Complaint is **DISMISSED**.

/s/ William H. Pryor Jr.

Chief Judge