

DEC 16 2025

David J. Smith  
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the  
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

---

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90253

---

**ORDER**

An individual has filed a Complaint against a United States bankruptcy 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 the Subject Judge was assigned to four cases filed by a certain debtor. In the most recently filed case, the debtor filed a “Motion to Impose the Automatic Stay,” and the Subject Judge granted the motion.

**Complaint**

Complainant contends that the Subject Judge granted the debtor an extended automatic stay in the most-recent case despite his “history of multiple filings within a short period, which

ordinarily triggers the limitations of 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3) and § 362(c)(4).” Complainant states, “Granting extended stay protection to a serial filer under these circumstances raises concerns about a pattern of inconsistent application of statutory safeguards designed to prevent abuse of the bankruptcy process.” Complainant also states that his “concern is that the judge’s actions may reflect a broader practice that undermines statutory safeguards, creating the appearance of bias or failure to apply the law consistently.”

### **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 debtor's cases, 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, 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