

OCT 21 2025

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90209

ORDER

An individual has filed a Complaint against a United States bankruptcy 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 voluntary petition for Chapter 13 bankruptcy. Complainant later filed a motion to recuse the Subject Judge on the grounds that she was biased and had a conflict of interest, and the Subject Judge denied the motion. The Subject Judge later entered an order denying confirmation of a proposed Chapter 13 plan and dismissing the case without prejudice.

Complaint

Complainant alleges the Subject Judge “has been prejudiced against my case for a long time,” had a conflict of interest, and denied a motion to recuse despite the conflict of interest, and she states she expects the Subject Judge will retaliate against her for filing the motion to recuse. Complainant states that an attorney “worked closely with the Judge” on other cases and that the Subject Judge made several statements “expressing major prejudice in their favor.” She complains that the Subject Judge declined to consider evidence of wrongdoing by a bank.

Complainant alleges the Subject Judge made the following “worrisome and threatening remarks”: “‘You’re paying those fees or it’s back to state,’ ‘End of the Road for You,’ ‘We do things differently here,’ ‘I’ll be the judge of that,’ ‘Well the creditor doesn’t want it so.’” She alleges the Subject Judge exhibited a “[l]ack of composure and constant scolding, dismissal and denigration made it hard to conceal prejudice against me the Debtor.” She states she is “frequently unable to finish my arguments in Court due to being cut off and silenced,” and it appears she alleges that the Subject Judge discriminated against her based on her national origin and disability by referring to someone “‘like me.’”

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, had conflict of interest, treated her in a demonstrably egregious and hostile manner, discriminated against her, 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