

JUL 16 2025

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-25-90111 through 11-25-90113

ORDER

An individual has filed a Complaint against three 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.

As an initial matter, after Complainant filed her Complaint, she filed a supplement. The filing of the supplement is permitted. *See* 11th Cir. JCDR 6.7.

Background

The record establishes that Complainant filed a civil complaint against multiple defendants, and she later filed an amended and a second amended complaint. The case was then reassigned to the First Subject Judge who issued an order dismissing the second amended complaint as “frivolously pleaded.” Complainant filed a

third amended complaint, and the First Subject Judge dismissed the third amended complaint as frivolous.

The record establishes that Complainant filed another civil complaint against multiple defendants. The case was later reassigned to the First Subject Judge who issued an order dismissing the complaint without prejudice. Complainant filed an amended complaint and a motion to recuse the First Subject Judge, and the First Subject Judge entered an order dismissing the amended complaint and denying the motion to recuse.

The record also establishes that Complainant and another individual filed a civil complaint against multiple defendants. The case was initially reassigned to the Third Subject Judge, then was reassigned to the First Subject Judge, and was finally reassigned to the Second Subject Judge. The Second Subject Judge entered an order dismissing the complaint without prejudice for failure to state a claim on which relief could be granted.

Complaint

Complainant states she believes the Subject Judges and others obstructed justice and engaged in a “cover up” to dismiss her cases. She contends her cases were improperly reassigned and were dismissed despite that certain defendants never responded to the claims and despite evidence supporting her claims. Complainant also alleges the First Subject Judge showed bias, engaged in a pattern of obstruction, retaliated against her, failed to recuse, and violated the Code of Conduct for United States Judges.

Supplement

In her supplement, Complainant alleges that the First Subject Judge refused to review her evidence. She states, “The dismissal of all my cases for the same reason shows a pattern [of] judicial bias ignoring evidence,” and that her cases were treated differently “showing selective enforcement.” She attached documents to her supplement.

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 obstructed justice, engaged in a cover up, were biased, retaliated against her, violated the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, 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