FILED
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT
JUDICIAL COUNCIL
DEC 4 2025

CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

#### CONFIDENTIAL

## Before the Judicial Council of the

### Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90211

#### **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 4th 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 27 2025

David J. Smith Clerk

#### **CONFIDENTIAL**

Before the Chief Judge of the Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90211

#### **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.

#### **Background**

The record establishes that Complainant filed a civil complaint against two defendants and a motion to submit documents electronically. The Subject Judge denied the motion to submit documents electronically. Complainant filed a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The Subject Judge issued a report recommending that the *in forma pauperis* motion be denied and that the complaint be dismissed, finding the allegations in the complaint were conclusory and that the complaint was an impermissible shotgun pleading. Complainant then filed a motion for reconsideration of the

order denying her motion to submit documents electronically, which the Subject Judge denied. The case was later reassigned to a different magistrate judge.

#### Complaint

Complainant alleges the Subject Judge discriminated against her and denied her a reasonable accommodation by denying her motion to submit documents electronically and motion for reconsideration. She contends the Subject Judge failed to explain or substantiate his finding that her complaint was conclusory. She also alleges the Subject Judge exhibited a pattern of discriminatory recommendations and orders.

#### 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, report, recommendations, 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, 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