

NOV 28 2025

CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Judicial Council of the  
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

---

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90182

---

**ORDER**

Before: ROSENBAUM, NEWSOM, and BRANCH, Circuit Judges; BEAVERSTOCK and WINSOR, 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 28th day of November, 2025.

FOR THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL:

/s/ Robin S. Rosenbaum

United States Circuit Judge

SEP 25 2025

David J. Smith  
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the  
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

---

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90182

---

**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 multiple defendants. She filed two motions to proceed *in forma pauperis*, which a magistrate judge denied. Complainant filed a motion for reconsideration, and the magistrate judge entered an order denying the motion and directing her to pay the full filing fee or submit a complete *in forma pauperis* motion. Complainant appealed, and this Court clerically dismissed the appeal for want of prosecution. The Subject Judge then dismissed the case for

Complainant's failure to pay the fee or to file a completed *in forma pauperis* motion.

### **Complaint**

Complainant alleges the Subject Judge violated the Code of Conduct for United States Judges "by failing and refusing to mandate fairness, impartiality, integrity or upholding his oath of office and his oath [to] the U.S. Constitution in this case," in violation of her "constitutional rights to seek justice and relief without any abuse, biasness, prejudice or special treatment by any judge or judicial personnel." She contends the Subject Judge obstructed justice, acted without jurisdiction, contacted this Court "to have them dismiss the appeal without issuing mandate," and "demand[ed] the case back without any motion or notice to" her. She also takes issue with the denial of her *in forma pauperis* motions.

Complainant states, "This judge acts of interference disrupt, delay and interrupts the due of administration of justice, this judge allows this court to place barriers which prevents the legal process to function adequately." She also states that the Subject Judge's "acts, lack of acts, abuse, interference, misconduct has shown and proven that there may be conflict of interest or he has the inability to conduct himself impartial[ly] due to his relationship" with the defendants.

### **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 not impartial, had a conflict of interest, 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