

JUN 27 2025

CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Judicial Council of the  
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

---

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-25-90069 through 11-25-90071

---

**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

MAY 08 2025

David J. Smith  
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the  
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

---

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-25-90069 through 11-25-90071

---

**ORDER**

An individual has filed a Complaint against three United States circuit 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.

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

**Background**

The record establishes that Complainant filed in this Court two petitions for review challenging a final administrative removal order. A panel composed of the Subject Judges granted the government's motion to dismiss the petitions for lack of jurisdiction.

Complainant filed motions to amend, reconsider, and set aside the panel's order, and the panel denied the motions.

### **Previous Judicial Complaint**

Complainant filed a previous judicial complaint against the Subject Judges pertaining to their orders in the above-described cases. That complaint was dismissed as merits-related, and the Judicial Council Review Panel affirmed.

### **Complaint**

Complainant states his Complaint "may be construed" as a request for reconsideration of the dismissal of his previous complaint "where new law may contradict such ruling." He cites a recent Supreme Court case in support. He attached documents to his Complaint, and in one attachment, he appears to take issue with the Subject Judges' orders in the above-described cases.

### **Supplement**

In his supplement, Complainant reiterates his arguments and discusses the recent Supreme Court decision.

### **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. Complainant’s allegations concern the substance of the Subject Judges’ orders in the above-described cases, and they are directly related to the merits of the Subject Judges’ decisions or procedural rulings. Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(B). For that reason, this Complaint is **DISMISSED**.

/s/ William H. Pryor Jr.  
Chief Judge