

MAY 26 2026

CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Judicial Council of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-26-90044

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 26th day of May, 2026.

FOR THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL:

/s/ Robin S. Rosenbaum

United States Circuit Judge

MAR 13 2026

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-26-90044

ORDER

An attorney 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 trust, through Complainant, filed a civil complaint in state court against multiple defendants who removed the case to federal court. The Subject Judge later consolidated the case with others filed by the same plaintiff. The Subject Judge later entered an order disbaring Complainant from practice before the district court and dismissing four cases with prejudice. The Subject Judge also ruled that the plaintiff was a vexatious litigant and permanently enjoined her from initiating new cases without leave of court. The Subject Judge then entered an

order directing the plaintiff to show cause why she should not be held in criminal contempt for violating a court order. There continues to be activity in the case.

Complaint

Complainant alleges the Subject Judge exceeded his authority, violated “constitutional due process protections,” and violated the Code of Conduct for United States Judges when he “treated the beneficiary as if he were a litigant and attempted to impose coercive authority over him,” in violation of two Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Complainant states, “By directing contempt authority toward a non-party without establishing jurisdiction or participation, the court acted outside the procedural limits governing federal injunctions.” Complainant contends the Subject Judge’s actions “raise serious due process concerns under the Fifth Amendment,” and “implicate[] several provisions of the Code of Conduct for United States Judges.” She attached documents to her 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 consolidated 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 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