

DEC 31 2025

David J. Smith  
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the  
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

---

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90261

---

**ORDER**

An individual has filed a Complaint against 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.

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

**Background**

The record establishes that Complainant filed a civil complaint against multiple defendants. She later filed a motion that the Subject Judge construed as a motion to file an amended complaint and granted, and she then filed an amended complaint. After additional filings in which Complainant challenged notices of appearance filed by attorneys, the Subject Judge entered an order finding

that all of the attorneys in the case had properly appeared before the court. The defendants then filed motions to dismiss the amended complaint.

Complainant filed a notice stating she had filed a judicial complaint with the Eleventh Circuit Judicial Council in connection with the case, and she stated that a copy of the judicial complaint and its attachments would be served on all “purported” counsel of record. The Subject Judge issued an order directing Complainant to file a copy of her judicial complaint and its attachments on the docket in the case “[t]o ensure a complete and accurate record of the proceedings.” Complainant then filed notices stating that judicial complaints were confidential and that she determined not to provide copies of her judicial complaint to counsel of record. The Subject Judge then entered an order rescinding the order requiring Complainant to file a copy of her judicial complaint and attachments on the record and ordering her not to mention the filing of a judicial complaint on the docket again. The case remains pending.

### **Complaint**

Complainant states that the Subject Judge violated the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, was biased, and engaged in a “pattern of irregular, inconsistent, and unexplained judicial actions that undermine confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the judiciary.” Complainant asserts that multiple attorneys appeared in the case without evidence of admission. She contends the Subject Judge entered an order in which he found that all attorneys had

properly appeared before the court, but did not state that the attorneys were properly admitted, which created an appearance that he was “shielding unadmitted counsel” or “avoiding verification required by Rule 11(a).” Complainant states there were “docket irregularities,” modifications to docket entries, and “unusual and inconsistent stamps” on filings. She states there was an “unexplained alteration” in the “PACER Case Locator” made after she filed a notice “highlighting admission concerns,” and that the “discrepancy supports concerns of selective docket manipulation and threatens confidence under Canon 2.”

Complainant contends that the Subject Judge favored the defendants, “typically responded instantly” to their filings, acted on their motions without giving her an opportunity to respond, and accepted their filings “at face value.” In contrast, Complainant alleges, the Subject Judge delayed ruling on her motions. She also contends there was an appearance of coordinated actions in federal and state courts, as events would occur in federal court shortly after “key state-court events.” Complainant alleges the Subject Judge had a conflict of interest stemming from his prior employment as a Deputy Attorney General and that he failed to report the conflict and created an appearance of partiality. She also takes issue with state-court proceedings and the actions of other individuals.

### **Supplements**

After she filed her Complaint, Complainant filed two supplements. In the first supplemental filing, Complainant identifies newly discovered “irregularities” in state-court filings and clarifies

the timing of certain filings. She also states she received a voicemail from defense counsel shortly after filing her judicial complaint, which she states contributed to her concerns about “coordinated procedural conduct involving counsel and the presiding judge” and the appearance that her filings “may be monitored and reacted to outside normal procedural channels.”

In her second supplemental filing (titled “Third Supplemental Submission”), Complainant describes more-recent events in the case and “numerous additional docketing irregularities.” She also alleges that the Subject Judge ordered her to publicly file her judicial complaint on the docket, which she states is “an unusual procedural requirement.”

### **Limited Inquiry**

Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(a) requires the Chief Judge to review complaints of judicial misconduct or disability and determine what actions should be taken on them. Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(b) states in part, “In determining what action to take under Rule 11(a), the chief judge may conduct a limited inquiry. The chief judge, or a designee, may communicate orally or in writing with . . . the subject judge . . .” *See also* 28 U.S.C. § 352(a). In conducting the limited inquiry, the Chief Judge “must not determine any reasonably disputed issue.” Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(b).

As part of a limited inquiry, I asked the Subject Judge to respond to the statement in Complainant’s supplemental filing that he issued an order directing her to file a copy of her judicial complaint and its attachments on the docket. I also asked that he

address whether the order was contrary to the confidentiality provisions of the Judicial Council and Disability Act and the Judicial-Conduct Rules.

The Subject Judge responded that he issued the order directing Complainant to file a copy of her judicial complaint and its attachments on the docket after she “waived/breached any confidentiality that either of us had in the review of that complaint” to “ensure that the trial record was preserved.” The Subject Judge also states that Complainant did not file the judicial complaint and attachments on the docket and that he rescinded the order directing her to do so.

## **Discussion**

### **1. Confidentiality of Judicial-Complaint Proceedings**

The Judicial Conduct and Disability Act states, “Except as provided in section 355, all papers, documents, and records of proceedings related to investigations conducted under this chapter shall be confidential and shall not be disclosed by any person in any proceeding except” in certain circumstances. 28 U.S.C. § 360(a). Judicial-Conduct Rule 23(b)(1) states in part:

The consideration of a complaint by a chief judge, a special committee, a judicial council, or the Committee on Judicial Conduct and Disability is confidential. Information about this consideration must not be publicly disclosed by any judge or judicial employee, or by any person who records or transcribes testimony except as allowed by these Rules.

Although Complainant revealed in a filing that she had filed a judicial complaint against the Subject Judge, it appears the Subject Judge's order directing her to file the complaint and its attachments on the public docket was contrary to the confidentiality provisions of the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act and Judicial-Complaint Rules.

## **2. Voluntary Corrective Action**

Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(d)(2) states, "The chief judge may conclude a complaint proceeding in whole or in part if ... the chief judge determines that the subject judge has taken appropriate voluntary corrective action that acknowledges and remedies the problems raised by the complaint." *See also* 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(2). The "Commentary on Rule 11" instructs that "action taken after a complaint is filed is 'appropriate' when it acknowledges and remedies the problem raised by the complaint." The Commentary continues:

Because the Act deals with the conduct of judges, the emphasis is on correction of the judicial conduct that was the subject of the complaint. Terminating a complaint based on corrective action is premised on the implicit understanding that voluntary self-correction or redress of misconduct or a disability is preferable to sanctions.

(Citations omitted).

The Subject Judge has rescinded the order directing Complainant to file her judicial complaint and attachments on the public

docket and directed her not to mention the filing of a judicial complaint on the docket again. In the light of this development, I conclude the Subject Judge has taken appropriate voluntary corrective action that acknowledges and remedies the problems created by the previous order. Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(d)(2). For this reason, this Complaint proceeding is **CONCLUDED** to the extent it concerns an allegation that the Subject Judge issued an order that was contrary to the confidentiality provisions in the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act and Judicial-Complaint Rules.

### **3. Remaining Allegations**

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.

Furthermore, Judicial-Conduct Rule 4(b)(2) provides that cognizable misconduct does not include “an allegation about delay in rendering a decision or ruling, unless the allegation concerns an improper motive in delaying a particular decision or habitual delay in a significant number of unrelated cases.” The “Commentary on Rule 4” states that “a complaint of delay in a single case is excluded as merits-related.”

As to the remaining allegations, the Complaint fails to present a basis for a finding of misconduct. To the extent the remaining 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). To the extent Complainant’s remaining claims are not merits-related, they 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, had a conflict of interest, 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** as to the remaining allegations.

/s/ William H. Pryor Jr.  
Chief Judge