

**FEB 3 2026**

CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Judicial Council of the  
**Eleventh Judicial Circuit**

---

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90238

---

**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 February, 2026.

FOR THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL:

/s/ Robin S. Rosenbaum

United States Circuit Judge

DEC 01 2025

David J. Smith  
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the  
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

---

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90238

---

**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 seven supplements. The filing of the supplements is permitted. *See* 11th Cir. JCDR 6.7.

**Background**

The record establishes that Complainant and three other individuals filed a civil complaint against multiple defendants. Complainant then filed multiple motions seeking various types of relief. The Subject Judge entered an order directing all plaintiffs to sign every filing submitted after the date of the order and stating that any filing that did not include all signatures would be stricken. The

Subject Judge then issued an order granting certain motions and denying others. The Subject Judge ruled that some defendants had not been properly served and that entry of a clerk's default against other defendants was appropriate, but that default judgment was not warranted against those defendants. The case remains pending.

### **Complaint**

Complainant alleges that the Subject Judge failed to notify the plaintiffs of procedural requirements and repeatedly dismissed filings without notice, hearings, or legal explanation. He states that the Subject Judge and clerk initially accepted and docketed motions he filed, but later asserted that all plaintiffs were required to sign each motion. He states the Subject Judge retroactively dismissed those filings without prejudice "while allowing defendants to act upon them by filings motions to set aside default."

Complainant alleges the Subject Judge failed to construe liberally *pro se* pleadings, dismissed plaintiffs' filings "for minor technical defects," and afforded counseled defendants "procedural leniency." He alleges the "unequal treatment" reflected "bias inconsistent with judicial impartiality." Complainant asserts that mailed filings were "delayed or mishandled" and that the Subject Judge "failed to correct or address these administrative errors, ratifying obstruction that disadvantaged the plaintiffs and aided the defendants." Complainant contends that the Subject Judge's decision in an unrelated case "appeared to continuously shield certain appointed officials." He states, "The cumulative effect of these procedural irregularities – the failure to require filings from represented

defendants, the disregard of mandatory Charter provisions, and the absence of judicial hearings – reflects a pattern of selective enforcement and preferential treatment toward politically appointed officials.”

Complainant alleges the Subject Judge’s actions eroded public confidence in the integrity of the judiciary and violated canons of the Code of Conduct for United States Judges. He also states that past failures of anti-poverty programs “illustrate a continuing pattern of neglect toward marginalized communities” and that the “same administrative indifference appears here—through selective enforcement, obstruction, and procedural irregularities.” He attached documents to his Complaint.

### **Supplements**

In his supplemental filings, Complainant reiterates his allegations, contends that the Subject Judge acted without proper consent, and includes various case-related filings and other materials.

### **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 otherwise not impartial, 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