

JAN 14 2026

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-25-90270 through 11-25-90272

ORDER

An individual has filed a Complaint against three United States circuit judges 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 three supplements. The filing of the supplements is permitted. *See* 11th Cir. JCDR 6.7.

Background

The record establishes that Complainant filed an application for leave to file a second or successive petition for a writ of habeas corpus. The Subject Judges issued an order dismissing the application in part and denying it in part. The order stated that Complainant alleged that one of her claims relied on newly discovered

evidence that her mother, who testified against her at trial, had confessed to narcotics trafficking before Complainant's arrest.

Complaint

Complainant alleges the Subject Judges made "numerous misstatements of the facts" and "lied" by stating that she claimed her mother was a drug dealer, when she stated that a different individual was a drug trafficker. Complainant alleges the Subject Judges' "inflammatory, prejudicial and biased comments" violated her due-process rights, created "structural errors," caused a miscarriage of justice, and destroyed her mother's reputation. Complainant also asserts that the Subject Judges treated her differently because of her race in violation of her equal-protection rights, and she takes issue with events that occurred in the district court.

Supplements

In her first supplemental filing, Complainant lists various "constitutional questions." In the second supplemental filing, she asserts that the Subject Judges' misconduct required the reversal of her conviction. In the third supplemental filing, she alleges that the Subject Judges violated federal laws, and she raises allegations against certain state-court judges.

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’ order 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 improper motive, were biased or otherwise not impartial, made false statements, engaged in racial discrimination, 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