

MAY 18 2026

CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Judicial Council of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-26-90030

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 18th day of May, 2026.

FOR THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL:

/s/ Robin S. Rosenbaum

United States Circuit Judge

FEB 26 2026

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-26-90030

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 a federal grand jury returned a superseding indictment charging a leader of a certain religious group with various crimes. After a jury found the defendant guilty on most counts, the Subject Judge sentenced the defendant to a term of imprisonment. This Court affirmed.

Complaint

Complainant alleges that in the above-described case, the Subject Judge was racist, was biased, should have recused himself,

imposed an unjust sentence, had a “personal vendetta against African Americans,” “hated” the defendant and the defendant’s teachings, violated the defendant’s human rights, did not “adhere to the law of case assignments,” inappropriately reviewed a website during trial, and improperly held court on the birthday of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Complainant contends that the defendant was entitled to diplomatic immunity and that the case should have been dismissed at the outset. He also takes issue with the Subject Judge’s actions in other cases and with the actions of other individuals.

Previous Complaints

Complainant identifies three previous judicial complaints that were filed against the Subject Judge, all of which were dismissed. In the most recent previous complaint, I determined that the “claims that the Subject Judge manipulated case assignments, was biased against the religious group, exhibited racism, should have recused himself from cases involving the group, improperly reviewed a website during trial, and improperly held court on Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.’s birthday, have already been considered in connection with previous complaints filed against the Subject Judge.” The Judicial Council Review Panel affirmed the dismissal of that complaint and denied the petition for review.

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. Most of Complainant’s allegations have previously been considered. 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 engaged in misconduct. Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D). For these reasons, this Complaint is **DISMISSED**.

/s/ William H. Pryor Jr.
Chief Judge