

SEP 29 2025

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90183

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 an amended civil complaint against multiple defendants. The case was initially assigned to the Subject Judge who issued an order referring the case to a magistrate judge, and the case was then reassigned to a different district judge.

The record also establishes that Complainant filed another civil complaint against various defendants and multiple motions seeking various types of relief, including a motion to recuse the Subject Judge and other judges. The Subject Judge entered an order

denying the motion to recuse. A magistrate judge issued a report recommending that Complainant's motions be denied and that the case be dismissed. Over Complainant's objections, the Subject Judge adopted the report and recommendation. Complainant appealed and filed motions to proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal, and the Subject Judge denied the motions.

Complaint

Complainant contends that the Subject Judge refused to recuse himself despite that he had a conflict of interest and personal knowledge of her cases stemming from his involvement in the first above-described. She alleges that the Subject Judge has given misleading information that has hindered her cases, denied her *in forma pauperis* motions despite being aware of her income, and has been notified that individuals obstructed justice and stole documents and evidence from her cases.

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 cases, 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, 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