

MAY 6 2026

CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Judicial Council of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-26-90020

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 6th day of May, 2026.

FOR THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL:

/s/ Robin S. Rosenbaum

United States Circuit Judge

FEB 20 2026

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-26-90020

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 her Complaint, she filed four supplements. The filing of the supplements is permitted. *See* 11th Cir. JCDR 6.7.

Background

The record establishes that Complainant filed an amended civil complaint against multiple defendants, and the defendants moved to dismiss it. Complainant filed a notice stating she had filed a complaint of judicial misconduct with the Eleventh Circuit Judicial Council related to the case, and she stated that a copy of the judicial complaint and its attachments would be served on all

counsel of record. The Subject Judge issued an order directing Complainant to file a copy of her judicial complaint and its attachments on the docket in the case “[t]o ensure a complete and accurate record of the proceedings.” Complainant then filed notices stating that judicial complaints were confidential and that she decided not to provide copies to counsel.

The Subject Judge later rescinded the order requiring Complainant to file a copy of her judicial complaint and attachments and ordered her not to mention the filing of a judicial complaint on the docket again. Complainant moved to recuse the Subject Judge, and the Subject Judge issued an order stating that her motion included a document marked “confidential,” directing the clerk to seal the motion, and warning Complainant that she would be sanctioned if she filed any judicial-complaint related materials in the case. The case remains pending.

Complaint

Complainant states her Complaint concerns the Subject Judge’s “interference with a pending administrative proceeding and a breach of statutory confidentiality protected by 28 U.S.C. § 360(a) and Judicial Conduct Rule 23(b).” She states that the Subject Judge directed her to file a copy of her previous judicial complaint and its attachments on the public docket and that he rescinded the order approximately 11 days later “without acknowledging that issuing it was improper.” Complainant contends that by issuing the order, the Subject Judge “attempt[ed] to alter the status of a pending misconduct review through judicial orders in a related case.”

Complainant notes that she filed a previous complaint addressing the matter that was concluded based on voluntary corrective action, but states her “new complaint seeks independent review of that conduct and of the process by which the confidentiality violation was deemed resolved without acknowledgment or remedial guidance.” She also states, “Rescission of the disclosure order without acknowledgment or corrective guidance does not constitute ‘voluntary corrective action’ within the meaning of Rule 11(d)(2) and does not preclude further review.”

Complainant also alleges that a document filed on the docket differed “in form and appearance” from the document she submitted to the court. She states that language in an order was omitted from the docket text, which “constitutes a potential breach of record integrity.” She states that after her previous judicial-complaint matter was concluded, the Subject Judge threatened her with sanctions for filing and referencing judicial-misconduct materials. She contends this threat interfered with her rights under the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act and “undermine[d] confidence in the independence of disciplinary processes.” She also contends that the Subject Judge’s “altered tone and form of address in that order, coinciding with the sanction threat, reflect a departure from the standards required by Canon 3(A)(3) and create a reasonable appearance of partiality or loss of impartial demeanor.” She attached documents to her Complaint.

Supplements

In her first supplemental filing, Complainant contends that the docket text for an order “does not reflect all material portions of the order as issued,” and she states that “the docket entry therefore does not fully reflect provisions of the order that impose prospective filing restrictions.” In her second supplemental filing, Complainant states that the sealing of her recusal motion and the “continued absence of docket activity or acknowledgment” of certain filings “limits public visibility into proceedings directly involving questions of judicial impartiality.” She states that the sealing of her recusal motion and inaccurate description of it “may create the appearance of adverse treatment associated with the filing of that motion,” could discourage the filing of such motions, and could affect public confidence in the fairness and transparency of judicial proceedings. Complainant’s third supplemental filing is of documents. In her fourth supplemental filing, Complainant states that the Subject Judge’s order on the public docket differs from the one received by mail, and the “mailed version contains additional paragraphs referencing sanctions and filing restrictions that do not appear in the docketed version.” She states that the “discrepancy concerns matters of record accuracy and confidentiality.”

Previous Complaint

Complainant filed a previous judicial complaint against the Subject Judge. In a supplement to that complaint, she stated that the Subject Judge had directed her to file a copy of her judicial complaint and its attachments on the public docket.

The previous complaint was concluded to the extent it concerned an allegation that the Subject Judge issued an order that was contrary to the confidentiality provisions in the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act and Judicial-Complaint Rules. I concluded that the Subject Judge took appropriate voluntary corrective action that acknowledged and remedied the problems created by the order by rescinding the order and directing Complainant not to mention the filing of a judicial complaint on the docket again. No petition for review was filed, and the matter is closed.

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 alleges the Subject Judge engaged in misconduct by issuing an order that violated the confidentiality provisions of the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act and Judicial-Conduct Rules, those allegations have already been considered in connection with her previous complaint. Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(2). To the extent Complainant's remaining 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, was not impartial, improperly manipulated filings or the docket, 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