

MAR 17 2026

CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Judicial Council of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-26-90004

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

FEB 03 2026

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-26-90004

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 his Complaint, he filed a supplement. The filing of the supplement is permitted. *See* 11th Cir. JCDR 6.7.

Background

The record establishes that Complainant filed a *pro se* civil complaint against multiple defendants. Complainant later filed motions for entry of a default, which the Subject Judge referred to a magistrate judge, and the magistrate judge denied the motions. There continues to be activity in the case.

The record also establishes that Complainant filed two petitions for a writ of mandamus, complaining that the Subject Judge failed to take action in the case and improperly referred matters to a magistrate judge. Those petitions remain pending.

Complaint

Complainant alleges that the Subject Judge failed “to timely perform mandatory administrative duties, including managing default posture and enforcing required procedural sequencing,” and he complains that the Subject Judge failed to direct the clerk to enter a default against the defendants. He alleges the Subject Judge improperly delegated “threshold and post-default motions” to a magistrate judge. Complainant contends the Subject Judge engaged in “administrative neglect and delay” and persistently delayed acting in the case. He asserts the “cumulative effect of these actions” has “impeded orderly case administration,” “permitted continued motion practice without resolving threshold posture,” and “imposed disproportionate burdens on a pro se, 100% disabled veteran litigant.”

Supplement

In his supplemental filing, Complainant reiterates his allegations and contends the Subject Judge “created an administrative ‘loop’ that prevents the case from progressing” by referring motions to the magistrate judge without addressing Complainant’s challenges to the magistrate judge’s authority. He alleges the Subject Judge engaged in “retaliatory case management” after he filed a mandamus petition, and he contends the “timing and hostile

tone” of two orders “suggest an intent to chill the Complainant’s right to seek appellate review.” Finally, Complainant alleges the Subject Judge failed to provide him reasonable accommodations, “creating a constructive bar to Complainant’s access to the court.”

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 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). 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, retaliated against him, treated him in a demonstrably egregious and hostile manner, 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