

MAY 28 2026

CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Judicial Council of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-26-90041

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 28th day of May, 2026.

FOR THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL:

/s/ Robin S. Rosenbaum

United States Circuit Judge

MAR 10 2026

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-26-90041

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 multiple defendants and moved to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The Subject Judge granted the motion, determined the complaint was deficient in numerous respects, and directed him to file an amended complaint. After he filed an amended complaint, the Subject Judge allowed one claim against one defendant to proceed and dismissed all other claims and defendants without prejudice. The defendant later moved to dismiss the amended complaint, and Complainant filed multiple motions seeking various

types of relief. The Subject Judge entered a scheduling order and an order regarding Complainant's pleading obligations with respect to the use of artificial intelligence. The case remains pending.

The record establishes that a corporate plaintiff filed in state court a civil complaint against Complainant, and he removed the case to federal court and filed a counterclaim and third-party complaint against other entities. The Subject Judge entered an order remanding the case to state court on the ground that Complainant failed to state a legitimate basis for the court's subject-matter jurisdiction. This Court clerically dismissed his appeal.

The record also establishes that Complainant filed a "Petition to Perpetuate Testimony and Preserve Evidence Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 27." Approximately two-and-a-half months later, the Subject Judge entered an order denying the petition and other motions because Complainant did not satisfy all the requirements of Rule 27(a). Complainant filed a motion for reconsideration, which the Subject Judge denied.

Complaint

Complainant alleges the Subject Judge retaliated against him as "a known federal whistleblower," failed to recuse in multiple cases, deliberately misapplied Rule 27 "to suppress evidence preservation," systematically denied his "constitutional rights at the federal courthouse," and failed to act on evidence of child endangerment. Complainant contends that in the first above-described case, the Subject Judge dismissed his claims against multiple defendants despite evidence of their wrongdoing.

As to the second case, Complainant contends that the state court issued a void default judgment after he removed the case to federal court, and he alleges that the Subject Judge treated the order as valid, deliberately returned the case “to the same court that had issued it without jurisdiction,” remanded the case despite knowing that the state court lacked jurisdiction, violated his constitutional right to a jury trial, and made an unsupported, pre-textual finding that he failed to file a complete state-court record.

As to the third case, Complainant alleges that one day after a previous judicial complaint he filed against the Subject Judge was dismissed, the Subject Judge denied his Rule 27 petition in a case that had been pending without judicial action for over a year. He contends that the timing of the ruling “raises a serious and obvious question of impartiality that [the Subject Judge] had an independent duty to address through recusal.” Complainant alleges the Subject Judge’s denial reflected “a fundamental misunderstanding of Rule 27(a) or a deliberate misapplication of it,” he contends that the “consequences of this misapplication are severe and irreversible,” and he describes the evidence he sought to preserve.

Complainant takes issue with the Subject Judge’s failure to recuse from his cases despite being aware that Complainant filed a judicial complaint against him. Complainant states, “The pattern of rulings – immediate action on a dormant case the day after receiving notice, denial of reconsideration months later connected to [events in a state-court case], and dismissal of most defendants in a beating case with video evidence – is not consistent with the

impartial administration of justice.” Complainant then alleges that, on multiple occasions, his constitutional rights were violated at the courthouse, and he states his briefcase was searched without a warrant, he was required to show government-issued identification, and he was denied entry for carrying a cellular telephone. Complainant contends that, taken together, the Subject Judge’s conduct reflects “a sustained and systematic pattern of denying Complainant access to the courts, suppressing his whistleblower claims, and retaliating against him for filing the original misconduct complaint.” He attached documents to his Complaint.

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 cases, 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, retaliated against him, 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