

DEC 23 2025

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-25-90259 and 11-25-90260

ORDER

An individual has filed a Complaint against a United States magistrate judge and a United States district 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 Complainant and another individual filed a civil complaint against a government agency and other defendants. They also moved to proceed *in forma pauperis* and for access to the court's electronic-filing system, and the Subject Magistrate Judge denied the motions. The plaintiffs again moved for access to the electronic-filing system, which the Subject Magistrate Judge denied because Complainant's financial affidavit established that he had significant financial resources. The plaintiffs also moved for service by the United States Marshals, which the Subject

Magistrate Judge denied based on Complainant's significant financial resources. The defendants later moved to stay discovery, and the Subject Magistrate Judge granted the motion.

The plaintiffs filed a "Motion for Reconsideration or Clarification of Indigency Determination and Request for Limited Court Assistance" in which they argued that the court's assessment of Complainant's finances was based on incomplete information and did not accurately reflect the plaintiffs' current financial condition. The Subject District Judge entered an order denying the motion. The order cautioned the plaintiffs that if they continued to file duplicative motions, they could be subject to sanctions. After additional proceedings, the stay was lifted, and the Subject District Judge entered an order dismissing the plaintiffs' complaint without prejudice due to the failure to exhaust administrative remedies and declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over state-law claims.

Complaint

Complainant states the Subject Judges denied him access to justice by denying his requests for electronic-filing access and United States Marshals assistance. He states the court found that he had the financial means to prosecute the case based on "incomplete and outdated information," refused to consider evidence of his financial hardship, and implied that he would be sanctioned for continuing to seek assistance, "effectively silencing me from making good-faith filings."

Complainant alleges the Subject Judges were biased in favor of the government, permitted it to file electronically, and granted its motion to stay discovery even though its ability to litigate was not materially impaired and without providing him an opportunity to respond. He states the court has “declined to mitigate” the “inequality” from only one side being given access to electronic filing. Complainant contends the Subject Judges’ actions created an appearance that the court is favoring the government and “demonstrate[d] a pattern of administrative convenience and judicial hostility superseding my right to access the courts.” He also alleges the Subject Judges deprived him of “meaningful due process,” violated the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, and “fail[ed] to address misrepresentations and procedural gamesmanship by opposing counsel.”

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, and orders in the above-described case, 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, treated him in a demonstrably egregious and hostile manner, 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