

JUN 27 2025

CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Judicial Council of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-25-90049 through 11-25-90051

ORDER

Before: ROSENBAUM, NEWSOM, and BRANCH, Circuit Judges; GARDNER 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 27th day of June, 2025.

FOR THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL:

/s/ Robin S. Rosenbaum

United States Circuit Judge

APR 04 2025

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-25-90049 through 11-25-90051

ORDER

An individual has filed a Complaint against a United States magistrate judge and two United States district judges 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 and other individuals filed a civil complaint against multiple defendants. The case was initially assigned to the Second Subject District Judge, but he disqualified himself from the case based on ownership of stock in one of the defendants. After various proceedings, Complainant filed a fifth amended complaint. The Subject Magistrate Judge issued a report recommending that the fifth amended complaint be dismissed on the grounds that it failed to state a claim and was frivolous. The Subject Magistrate Judge stated that Complainant's

allegations of “harassment from radiation, poisoning, and electrical beams are delusional and removed from reality.” Over Complainant’s objections, the First Subject District Judge adopted the report and recommendation and dismissed the fifth amended complaint. Complainant moved for reconsideration, which the First Subject District Judge denied. This Court affirmed.

Complainant also filed another civil complaint and a moved to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The Subject Magistrate Judge entered an order granting *in forma pauperis* status and directing Complainant to file an amended complaint to correct various deficiencies. Complainant then filed a motion to recuse the Subject Judges, which the Subject Magistrate Judge denied. Complainant later filed a third amended complaint. The Subject Magistrate Judge issued a report recommending that the third amended complaint be dismissed for failure to state a claim on which relief could be granted. The Subject Magistrate Judge stated that the complaint continued to include “fanciful sci-fi allegations of injecting her with ‘nanosensor’ and ‘medical nanotechnology’ devices.” Complainant moved for reconsideration, which the Subject Magistrate Judge denied. Over Complainant’s objections, the First Subject District Judge adopted the report and recommendation and dismissed the third amended complaint.

Complaint

Complainant states that the Subject Judges “withheld critical evidence related to nanotechnology that [she] provided to the court system,” that the “ongoing concealment of evidence and

manipulation within the court proceedings has misled the jury pool and compromised the fairness of my trial,” and that there is evidence suggesting that “employers and other external parties are involved in a conspiracy to manipulate information and mislead the court.” Complainant states that there “appears to be a selective approach to utilizing witnesses in my case,” and that she has concerns that the family members of the Subject Judges and others “may have engaged in bribery, allowing defendants to gain insight into my complaints and strategies.”

Next, Complainant contends that one of the Subject Judges “overlooked my disability and has held me to standards typically applied to attorneys.” She asserts she “has experienced ongoing slander from the judges, who have used terms that do not reflect reality and have attempted to alter my genuine life experiences.” She contends an order requiring her to remove references to cloaking systems and nanotechnology obstructed justice and “constitutes manipulation, as these elements are critical to identifying the subjects involved in my claims.” Complainant states she believes the actions of the Subject Judges and others have placed her family in danger, and she alleges that the Subject Judges’ actions constituted a breach of judicial duty, unfairly disadvantaged her, compromised her ability to present her case, and undermined the integrity of the judicial process. She also takes issue with the actions of other individuals, and she attached documents to her Complaint. In one attachment, she alleges the Subject Judges acted unethically, were biased against her, conspired to conceal evidence, and colluded to cover up criminal acts committed against her.

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.

The Complaint fails to present a basis for a finding of misconduct. To the extent Complainant’s allegations concern the substance of the Subject Judges’ official actions, findings, rulings, and orders in the above-described cases, the allegations are directly related to the merits of the Subject Judges’ 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 Judges acted with an illicit or improper motive, were biased, accepted bribes, were part of a conspiracy, slandered her, 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