

MAY 29 2025

David J. Smith  
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the  
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

---

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90084

---

**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 a civil complaint against two defendants. The Subject Judge later denied several motions filed by the Complainant because his claims appeared to be “based on the wholly discredited ‘sovereign citizen’ legal theory.” Complainant filed a motion for reconsideration, which the Subject Judge denied.

## **Complaint**

Complainant alleges the Subject Judge engaged in “a pattern of prejudicial denial, failure to adjudicate lawfully entered filings and evidence, and dismissal of constitutionally protected claims without review,” and he contends the Subject Judge “acted in prejudice” by denying motions without addressing the facts and evidence. Complainant states the Subject Judge labeled him a “sovereign citizen” “relying on generalizations and prior unrelated cases rather than addressing the specific and detailed record before the Court.” Complainant also alleges the Subject Judge ignored evidence of “interference with federal jurisdiction,” was biased, failed to protect constitutional rights, obstructed justice, and abused his discretion. He attached an order to his Complaint.

## **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 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, was biased or prejudiced, obstructed justice, 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