

DEC 19 2025

CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Judicial Council of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90204

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 19th day of December, 2025.

FOR THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL:

/s/ Robin S. Rosenbaum

United States Circuit Judge

OCT 17 2025

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90204

ORDER

An individual has filed a Complaint against a United States magistrate 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 six supplements. The filing of the supplements is permitted. *See* 11th Cir. JCDR 6.7.

Background

It does not appear that the Complainant was involved in any cases before the Subject Judge.

Complaint

Complainant alleges the Subject Judge “deleted email id on receipt of documents showing Postal Fraud in” a certain case “to

deny my voting rights when the Judge was hearing the same issue in” another case. He also states the Subject Judge “knows about Title IX mischief by” a certain entity.

Supplements

In his first supplemental filing, Complainant states that a certain criminal case “disappeared from PACER.” In the second, he states that the Subject Judge “deleted his email id to deny any knowledge of the evidence.” In the third, he asks why the Subject Judge did not transfer a case to another jurisdiction. In the fourth and fifth, he reiterates his allegation that the Subject Judge deleted his “email id.” In the sixth, he does not raise any specific allegations pertaining to the Subject Judge.

Discussion

The Complaint fails to present a basis for a finding of misconduct. Complainant provides no facts or evidence to raise an inference that the Subject Judge engaged in misconduct. Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D). For that reason, this Complaint is **DISMISSED**.

/s/ William H. Pryor Jr.
Chief Judge