

DEC 10 2025

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-25-90277

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 Complainant filed a civil complaint against federal judges and other individuals, as well as a motion to file electronically. The Subject Judge issued an initial order concerning case management and deadlines and an order denying the motion to file electronically. Complainant then filed an amended complaint adding the Subject Judge as a defendant, and the Subject Judge recused herself from the case.

Complaint

Complainant alleges the Subject Judge “took judicial action despite clear and disqualifying conflicts, failed to make required disclosures under 28 U.S.C. § 455, and recused herself only after being added as a defendant, confirming she was aware of the conflicts from the outset.” He asserts the Subject Judge’s conflict arose from her being assigned to a case where her colleagues were named as defendants, “she only recused once personally exposed,” and she “implicitly acknowledges she should have recused much earlier, when her colleagues were already defendants.” He contends her “delayed recusal” created an appearance that she “acted to shield fellow judges,” “sought to control the case’s procedural posture before recusal,” violated the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, and undermined public confidence in the neutrality of the court and of the “fairness of judge assignment systems.”

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 the 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). 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, 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**.

/s/ William H. Pryor Jr.
Chief Judge