

MAR 3 2026

CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Judicial Council of the  
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

---

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-25-90236 and 11-25-90237

---

**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 3rd day of March, 2026.

FOR THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL:

/s/ Robin S. Rosenbaum

United States Circuit Judge

NOV 25 2025

David J. Smith  
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the  
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

---

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-25-90236 and 11-25-90237

---

**ORDER**

An individual has filed a Complaint against two United States bankruptcy judges 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 two bankruptcy petitions his own behalf and he signed two other petitions on behalf of a company. The First Subject Judge was assigned to all four cases, which are now closed. In three of the cases, Complainant moved to reopen the cases, and the First Subject Judge entered orders either denying or striking his motions.

## **Complaint**

Complainant alleges the First Subject Judge engaged in a pattern of refusing to enforce orders, allowing the state court to violate federal statutes, and failing to provide justification for denying motions. He contends that the First Subject Judge's "refusal to reopen cases" prevented the enforcement of his own orders, allowed state courts to continue to violate federal bankruptcy law, denied the debtors access to a federal forum to enforce rights, undermined the integrity of the bankruptcy system, and contradicted established law.

Complainant alleges that the Second Subject Judge previously served as the First Subject Judge's law clerk, which resulted in a conflict of interest, and that she had "personal and professional loyalty" to the First Subject Judge. Complainant contends the previous employment created an appearance of impropriety in connection with the Second Subject Judge's administrative oversight over the First Subject Judge's case management, review of his orders, and response to complaints about his conduct. Complainant also states that he sent a letter to the Second Subject Judge requesting assistance, but that she provided no substantive assistance, which created the appearance that she was protecting the First Subject Judge from scrutiny. He contends the Subject Judges abdicated their responsibility to enforce federal law, obstructed the law, violated their oaths of office, violated the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, harmed him, and had a prejudicial impact on public confidence in the judiciary.

## 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 First 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 Judges’ 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 Judges acted with an illicit or improper motive, were biased or otherwise not impartial, had a conflict of interest, violated their oaths of office, violated the Code

of Conduct for United States Judges, 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