

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Judicial Council of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90199

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 22nd day of December, 2025.

FOR THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL:

/s/ Robin S. Rosenbaum

United States Circuit Judge

FILED
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

OCT 09 2025

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90199

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.

As an initial matter, after Complainant filed his Complaint, he filed five supplements. The filing of the supplements is permitted. *See* 11th Cir. JCDR 6.7.

Background

The record establishes that Complainant filed a civil complaint against multiple defendants and a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The Subject Judge denied the motion because it was not confirmed under oath. Complainant filed another *in forma pauperis* motion, and the Subject Judge entered an order granting the motion, dismissing the complaint as a shotgun pleading, directing

Complainant to file an amended complaint, and staying “the service-of-process provision in 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d) and service-of-process period in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m) until further order.”

Complainant then filed an amended complaint and multiple motions seeking various types of relief, including five motions to recuse the Subject Judge. The Subject Judge entered an order denying the motions to recuse. The Subject Judge also entered an order dismissing Complainant’s amended complaint as a shotgun pleading and for failure to state a claim.

The record establishes that Complainant filed another civil complaint against one defendant, a motion to proceed *informa pauperis*, a motion to take judicial notice, and a “Motion to Refer for Criminal Investigation.” The Subject Judge entered an order denying the motion to take judicial notice and motion to refer. The Subject Judge also entered an order granting the *informa pauperis* motion, directing Complainant to file an amended complaint that corrected certain deficiencies, and staying service-of-process.

Complainant then filed amended complaints naming state court judges as defendants and multiple motions seeking various types of relief. The Subject Judge entered orders denying certain motions and a report recommending that Complainant’s third amended complaint be dismissed on the ground that the defendants were entitled to immunity. Over Complainant’s objections, a district judge adopted the report and recommendation.

Complaint

Complainant alleges that in the two above-described cases, there was a “disturbing pattern of behavior involving attorneys, real estate professionals, and family members who—through deception, collusion, and abuse of legal process—have deprived me or my rightful inheritance, defamed my character, and obstructed justice at multiple levels.” He states the “misconduct includes,” among other things, the submission of false documents to judicial officers and fraud upon the court resulting in rulings based on false information. He contends the cases “reflect a calculated effort to weaponize the legal system against me” and “raise serious questions about criminal conspiracy, obstruction, and public corruption,” and he requests and investigation into the matters.

Supplements

In his first supplemental filing, Complainant asserts that the Subject Judge violated procedural norms, obstructed justice, “silenced truth,” and “desecrated the dignity owed to my late father and to the rule of law.” With respect to the above-described cases, Complainant alleges the Subject Judge ignored filings, exhibited a “pattern of delay and omission,” and issued orders that contradicted the factual record.

In the second supplemental filing, Complainant asserts that the Subject Judge was biased, engaged in “suppression and retaliation,” and covered up and was complicit in misconduct by others.

In the third supplemental filing, Complainant does not raise any specific allegations concerning the Subject Judge.

In the fourth supplemental filing, Complainant states, “The record reflects a sustained pattern of procedural starvation, suppression of evidence, and denial of dignity,” and he takes issue with the Subject Judge’s orders and rulings. He states the Subject Judge’s actions violated his constitutional right of access to the courts, suppressed evidence, and weaponized “procedural delay to erase next-of-kin rights and estate recognition.”

In the fifth supplemental filing, Complainant reiterates his allegations, takes issues with the Subject Judge’s orders and rulings, contends the “judiciary’s procedural evasion … is a form of institutional violence,” and complains about the clerk’s office and other judges.

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.

Furthermore, Judicial-Conduct Rule 4(b)(2) provides that cognizable misconduct does not include “an allegation about delay in rendering a decision or ruling, unless the allegation concerns an improper motive in delaying a particular decision or habitual delay in a significant number of unrelated cases.” The “Commentary on Rule 4” states that “a complaint of delay in a single case is excluded as 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, report, 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, was biased or otherwise not impartial, obstructed justice, engaged in retaliation, treated him in a demonstrably egregious and hostile manner, 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