

JUL 23 2025

David J. Smith  
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the  
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

---

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90123

---

**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 one defendant, and she later filed a motion for default judgment. A magistrate judge entered an order directing Complainant to explain why the case should not be dismissed for failure to timely effect service. Complainant filed a response and another motion for default judgment. The Subject Judge entered an order denying the motions for default judgment and dismissing the case without prejudice due to Complainant’s failure to timely serve the

defendant. Complainant filed a motion to reopen the case, which the Subject Judge denied.

### **Complaint**

Complainant alleges the Subject Judge was biased or prejudiced, showed a “lack of empathy or concern for this case,” failed to consider that her case may be “linked to other cases,” denied her right to be heard, “does not operate under the law,” concealed evidence and “discredited any evidence in this case,” “attempted to use his power of authority to make improper decisions concerning this case,” acted to “protect[] his associations,” and had a conflict of interest based on his “affiliations.”

### **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, abused his power, had a conflict of interest, 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