

MAR 3 2026

CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Judicial Council of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-25-90239 through 11-25-90243

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. 11-25-90239 through 11-25-90243

ORDER

An individual has filed a Complaint against two United States bankruptcy judges, one United States magistrate judge, and two United States district 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.

As an initial matter, after Complainant filed his Complaint, he filed two supplements. The filing of the supplements is permitted. *See* 11th Cir. JCDR 6.7.

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 Bankruptcy Judge issued orders granting the debtors a discharge in two of the cases,

confirmed a Chapter 11 plan and granted the debtor's motion for a final decree in one case, and dismissed one case on the ground that it was filed in bad faith. After the cases were closed, Complainant moved to reopen three cases, and the First Subject Judge entered orders either denying or striking those motions.

The record also establishes that Complainant filed a civil complaint against multiple defendants. The Subject Magistrate Judge issued a report recommending that the complaint be dismissed as a shotgun pleading. The First Subject District Judge issued an order adopting the report and recommendation.

Complaint

Complainant alleges the Subject Judges engaged in misconduct "through their systematic denial of emergency relief, failure to enforce federal bankruptcy discharge orders, failure to file mandatory criminal referrals, and coordination to prevent judicial review of ongoing violations." He states that after a discharge was granted, "creditors and third parties have engaged in systematic violations of the discharge injunction and confirmed plan, resulting in substantial financial losses." He states, "Despite filing hundreds of emergency motions documenting these violations with supporting evidence over eight years, the [Subject Judges] have consistently denied relief, refused to appoint counsel, failed to file criminal referrals required by federal statute, and coordinated to prevent any judicial review of the violations." He takes issue with various orders issued by the Subject Judges and the report and recommendation issued by the Subject Magistrate Judge.

Complainant contends that one of the Subject Bankruptcy Judges required that he obtain counsel in cases despite the “impossibility of obtaining representation,” and he complains that the Subject Bankruptcy Judge and Subject Magistrate Judge denied his requests for counsel. Complainant contends that the “pattern of denials across five judges over eight years suggests coordination to prevent any judicial view of the violations.” Next, he contends that the Second Subject Bankruptcy Judge’s “position as former law clerk to [the First Subject Bankruptcy Judge] creates an appearance of bias.” He states that he received an *ex parte* communication from the Second Subject Bankruptcy Judge’s deputy that attempted to dissuade him from filing emergency motions, which demonstrated inappropriate coordination. He alleges the Subject Judges’ actions undermined public confidence in the judiciary, and he seeks various types of relief.

Supplements

In the first supplemental filing, Complainant reiterates his allegations, takes issue with various orders, and states that the Subject Judges work in close proximity to each other, which supports that they have coordinated to deny him relief. In the second supplemental filing, Complainant reiterates his allegations and provides a timeline of events related to his cases.

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 Judges’ official actions, findings, rulings, report and recommendation, 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, improperly coordinated with each other, had a conflict of interest, engaged in improper *ex parte* communications, 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