

DEC 31 2025

David J. Smith  
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the  
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

---

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90266

---

**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.

**Background**

The record establishes that the Subject Judge was assigned to four cases that Complainant filed. In one case that Complainant filed against a state-court judge, he was designated as a restricted filer on the district court’s docket. In that case, the Subject Judge entered an order dismissing Complainant’s complaint, and Complainant then filed an amended complaint. The case remains pending.

## **Complaint**

Complainant alleges the Subject Judge engaged in improper *ex parte* communications, committed a crime, had the goal of obstructing justice, and violated the Code of Conduct for United States Judges. He states that a “series of irregularities” in his case against the state-court judge, “including having relevant evidence censored from public view and being given a designation as a ‘restricted filer,’ along with a sixth sense about the strange set of coincidences where all of the cases containing the most serious examples of criminal activity ... landing in the lap of a single judge,” led him to file a public records request concerning *ex parte* communications between the Subject Judge, the state-court judge who was the Subject Judge’s former colleague, and another state-court judge connected with the cases. He states that he received a response showing that such *ex parte* communications would take a state court’s “IT department two hours.” In support of his allegation, Complainant cites to documents he filed in another case in which requested from a state court a copy of all emails between the Subject Judge and a state-court judge, and General Counsel with the court responded that a search and legal review would take two hours and would cost a certain amount.

## **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 Complainant’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, engaged in improper *ex parte* communications, committed a crime, 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