

MAR 10 2022

David J. Smith  
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the  
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

---

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-22-90015 and 11-22-90016

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, 28 U.S.C. §§ 351-364.

---

**ORDER**

\_\_\_\_\_ (“Complainant”) has filed this Complaint against  
United States District Judges \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ (collec-  
tively, “the Subject Judges”), under 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”).

As an initial matter, after Complainant filed her Complaint, she filed a supplemental statement. The filing of the supplemental statement is permitted. *See* 11th Cir. JCDR 6.7.

### **Background**

The record shows that in January 2022 Complainant and another individual filed “Emergency Application for an Injunction to Restrain Crimes,” which was docketed as a civil rights complaint and an emergency motion for a preliminary injunction. The case was initially assigned to Judge \_\_\_\_\_ but was then reassigned to Judge \_\_\_\_\_ as the presiding district judge.

Judge \_\_\_\_\_ then set a hearing on the emergency motion for January 14, 2022, noting that failure to appear could result in denial of the motion or dismissal of the case. The next day, the plaintiffs filed a motion to recuse all the judges in the district as biased. A few days later, the plaintiffs filed a notice alleging that United States Marshals had, among other things, falsely imprisoned Complainant and hindered her from filing the motion to recuse.

On January 14, 2022, Judge \_\_\_\_\_ entered an order dismissing the case without prejudice due to the plaintiffs’ failure to appear at the hearing. Later that month, the plaintiffs filed an amended complaint. In February 2022, they filed a motion for reconsideration, a “Motion to Intervene as Plaintiff,” and a notice of appeal.

### **Complaint**

Complainant states she was (1) denied an emergency hearing; (2) “provocatively denied the name of the presiding district judge”; (3) falsely arrested by United States Marshals in retaliation for filing the motion to recuse; and (4) “forced” to amend her complaint. She also takes issue with the actions of individuals other than the Subject Judges, and she attached documents to her Complaint.

### **Supplement**

Complainant’s supplemental statement does not contain any specific allegations concerning the Subject Judges. She attached documents to her supplement.

### **Discussion**

Complainant provides no credible facts or evidence in support of a claim that the Subject Judges 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