

MAR 17 2026

CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Judicial Council of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90265

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 17th day of March, 2026.

FOR THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL:

/s/ Robin S. Rosenbaum

United States Circuit Judge

DEC 31 2025

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90265

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 Complainant filed a voluntary petition for Chapter 13 bankruptcy. After a bankruptcy judge confirmed an amended Chapter 13 plan, the Subject Judge was assigned to the case. The Subject Judge later ordered Complainant to show cause why sanctions should not be imposed in the light of her repetitive, frivolous, and vexatious filings. After a hearing, the Subject Judge imposed interim sanctions and prohibited Complainant from filing any document in the case unless it was signed by an attorney.

The Subject Judge later granted Complainant a discharge, and the case was closed. Afterward, Complainant filed two motions to enforce the order of discharge and two notices of appeal, and the Subject Judge entered orders striking the filings because they were not signed by an attorney.

Complaint

Complainant alleges the Subject Judge denied her right to self-representation in the case. She contends that she has been forced to pay additional funds to claimants outside of a contractual agreement and that she was “punitively denied a hearing to address matters on four occasions” based on the order prohibiting from filing documents unless signed by an attorney. She states, “The court’s refusal to grant me the opportunity to file and be heard on lien, levy and foreclosure attempts has caused financial burdens and undue hardship.” She attached documents to her Complaint.

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. All of Complainant's allegations concern the substance of the Subject Judge's official actions, findings, and orders in the above-described case, and the allegations are directly related to the merits of the Subject Judge's decisions or procedural rulings. Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(B). For that reason, this Complaint is **DISMISSED**.

/s/ William H. Pryor Jr.
Chief Judge