

APR 18 2025

CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Judicial Council of the  
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

---

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90018

---

**ORDER**

Before: ROSENBAUM, NEWSOM, and BRANCH, Circuit Judges; WALKER and BEAVERSTOCK, Chief District Judges.

Pursuant to 11th Cir. JCDR 18.3, this Judicial Council Review Panel has considered the materials described in JCDR 18(c)(2), including petitioner's complaint, the order of Chief United States Circuit Judge William H. Pryor Jr., and the petition for review filed by petitioner. No judge on this panel has requested that this matter be placed on the agenda of a meeting of the Judicial Council.

The Judicial Council Review Panel hereby AFFIRMS the disposition of this matter by Chief Judge Pryor. The petition for review is DENIED.

Done this 18th day of April, 2025.

FOR THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL:

/s/ Robin S. Rosenbaum

United States Circuit Judge

FEB 10 2025

David J. Smith  
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the  
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

---

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90018

---

**ORDER**

An individual has filed a Complaint against a United States district judge under the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980, 28 U.S.C. §§ 351–364, and the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States.

**Background**

The record establishes that Complainant filed an employment-discrimination complaint against a corporation. A district judge who is not the Subject Judge granted the defendant summary judgment and dismissed the action. This Court later vacated the summary judgment and remanded. After additional proceedings, the district judge again granted the defendant summary judgment and dismissed the action.

Years later, Complainant filed, among other things, a motion for relief based on newly discovered evidence, and the action

was reassigned to the Subject Judge as the presiding district judge. A magistrate judge issued an order denying Complainant's motions as frivolous and directing the clerk to refuse any future filings unless Complainant posted a monetary bond. Complainant later filed additional motions seeking various types of relief. The magistrate judge issued a report recommending that Complainant's motions be denied as frivolous and that she be sanctioned. The Subject Judge entered an order adopting the report and recommendation, denying all pending motions, and imposing sanctions on Complainant. This Court dismissed Complainant's appeal for lack of jurisdiction.

### **Complaint**

Complainant alleges the Subject Judge violated her civil rights, made "unauthorized decisions against" her, violated various statutes, committed a crime by delaying justice, and treated her in a demonstrably egregious and hostile manner "by calling me a notorious filer, among other inappropriate statements in his orders." Complainant states she believes the Subject Judge and "other federal judges in the past assigned to my case have been accepting bribes, gifts, or other personal favors related to the judicial misconduct." Complainant states she also believes the Subject Judge has been engaging in *ex parte* communications with the defendant's attorneys. She contends the Subject Judge "knowingly, willingly, and maliciously issued an authorized sanction against" her that prevented her from obtaining relief. She asserts that the Subject Judge "is a racist who has a serious problem with my sensitive personal data within the government system of records."

## Discussion

Judicial-Conduct Rule 4(b)(1) 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 explains the rationale for this rule as follows:

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.

Furthermore, Judicial-Conduct Rule 4(b)(2) provides that cognizable misconduct does not include “an allegation about delay in rendering a decision or ruling, unless the allegation concerns an improper motive in delaying a particular decision or habitual delay in a significant number of unrelated cases.” The “Commentary on Rule 4” states that “a complaint of delay in a single case is excluded as merits-related.”

The Complaint fails to present a basis for a finding of misconduct. To the extent Complainant’s allegations concern the substance of the Subject Judge’s official actions, findings, rulings, and

orders in the above-described case, the allegations are directly related to the merits of the Subject Judge's decisions or procedural rulings. Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(B). Complainant's remaining claims are based on allegations lacking sufficient evidence to raise an inference that the Subject Judge acted with an illicit or improper motive, committed a crime, treated Complainant in a demonstrably egregious and hostile manner, accepted bribes, gifts, or personal favors related to the case, engaged in racial discrimination, engaged in improper *ex parte* communications, or otherwise engaged in misconduct. Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D). For these reasons, this Complaint is **DISMISSED**.

/s/ William H. Pryor Jr.  
Chief Judge