

FEB 13 2026

CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Judicial Council of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90248

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 Acting Chief United States Circuit Judge Adalberto Jordan, 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 Acting Chief Judge Jordan. The petition for review is DENIED.

Done this 13th day of February, 2026.

FOR THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL:

/s/ Robin S. Rosenbaum

United States Circuit Judge

DEC 08 2025

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Acting Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90248

ORDER

An individual has filed a Complaint against a United States circuit 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 shows that Complainant filed a prior judicial complaint against a United States Magistrate Judge and a United States District Judge. The Subject Judge issued an order dismissing the complaint as merits-related and as based on allegations lacking sufficient evidence. Complainant filed a petition for review.

Complaint

Complainant alleges the Subject Judge “fail[ed] to comply with mandatory administrative rules related to the handling of a

Petition for Review” and “fail[ed] to promptly transmit the administrative record for a previously filed Petition for Review to the Judicial Council, as required by” the Judicial-Conduct Rules. She contends that a “significant and unreasonable period of time has passed” since she filed the petition for review. She also states she believes the Chief Judge has “zero intent to transmit the Petition for the Judicial Council.” She requests certain types of relief.

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.

In addition, the “Commentary on Rule 4” provides:

The phrase “decision or procedural ruling” is not limited to rulings issued in deciding Article III cases or

controversies. Thus, a complaint challenging the correctness of a chief judge's determination to dismiss a prior misconduct complaint would be properly dismissed as merits-related — in other words, as challenging the substance of the judge's administrative determination to dismiss the complaint — even though it does not concern the judge's rulings in Article III litigation.

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, 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, violated the Judicial-Conduct Rules, or otherwise engaged in misconduct. Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D). For these reasons, this Complaint is **DISMISSED**.

/s/ Adalberto Jordan
Acting Chief Judge