

JUN 27 2025

CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Judicial Council of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-25-90060 through 11-25-90063

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 27th day of June, 2025.

FOR THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL:

/s/ Robin S. Rosenbaum

United States Circuit Judge

APR 23 2025

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-25-90060 through 11-25-90063

ORDER

An individual has filed a Complaint against two United States district judges and two United States magistrate 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 filed a civil complaint against one defendant, and he later filed a motion for a default. The defendant filed a motion to dismiss. The Second Subject Magistrate Judge issued a report recommending that Complainant's motion for default be denied and the defendant's motion to dismiss be granted because the complaint is frivolous. Over Complainant's objections, the Second Subject District Judge adopted the report and recommendation.

The record also establishes that Complainant filed another civil complaint against one defendant, and he later filed two motion for default. The First Subject Magistrate Judge entered orders denying the motions for default. The defendant filed a motion to dismiss. The First Subject Magistrate Judge issued a report recommending that the complaint be dismissed. Over Complainant's objections, the First Subject District Judge adopted the report and recommendation.

Complaint

Complainant states, "There are many different issues in these cases" that the "biggest issue is that the cases are not being heard," and that "they were dismissed without an answer and discovery," which caused "an increase in court costs as well as lots of wasted time appealing and refileing cases." Complainant states the Subject Judges "possibly secretly think or are secretly being told that the issue is closed and that I can't sue," "are also possibly secretly influenced by corrupt FBI defamation," and "seem extremely biased in favor of the government who is the defense."

Complainant contends that the first-above described case was dismissed to cover up his allegations. He asserts that, in the second above-described case, the "defense very clearly defaulted" and the First Subject Magistrate Judge "blocked default multiple different times with completely nonsensical reasoning." Complainant states, "When I report things like this, it almost always goes into a black hole where I don't hear anything back, gets immediately closed, or nothing happens." Finally, he states, "This seems to

be an attempt by the judges to waste my time and money,” and that, “[d]ue to these issues, the entire court appears to be corrupt from my perspective.”

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, reports, recommendations, 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, 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